DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 034 821 UD 009 324

AUTHOR Tapscott, Elizabeth M.
TITLE State Summary of Title I ESEA for Fiscal Year 1967.
INSTITUTION Hawaii State Dept. of Education, Honolulu. Office of Instructional Services.
PUB DATE Nov 67
NOTE 56p.

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$2.90
DESCRIPTORS Achievement Gains, *Compensatory Education, *Disadvantaged Youth, *Educational Objectives, Handicapped Children, Language Arts, Program Effectiveness, *Program Evaluation, Reading Improvement, Standardized Tests, Statistical Data, Test Results
IDENTIFIERS *Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I Program, ESEA Title I Programs, Hawaii

ABSTRACT

This evaluation of 110 projects in which 17,298 disadvantaged children of the State of Hawaii participated in 1967 is based on professional observations, standardized test scores, and teacher-made tests. The report covers the following topics in the operation of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act Title I projects: (1) major achievements, (2) description of activities and methods, including State Educational Agency services to Local Educational Agencies, pressing educational needs, prevalent project objectives, Title I and other Federal program activities, staffing, and programs for non-public school and handicapped children, (3) problems resolved, (4) Statewide tabular data, Title I, fiscal year 1967, covering average daily attendance and membership, dropout rates, standardized test results, and post high school Title I graduates, (5) effective projects, (6) supplementary data on program effectiveness and dissemination of information, and (7) statistical data on participants, staff, activities, services, and expenditures. The overall conclusion of the evaluation was that some significant expansion and improvement of programs for disadvantaged children in Hawaii had been achieved. (RJ)

ED034821

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

PROGRAM REFERENCE SERVICE
CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION

09324 E

STATE SUMMARY OF TITLE I, ESEA

FOR

FISCAL YEAR 1967

STATE OF HAWAII
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF INSTRUCTIONAL SERVICES
BRANCH OF COMPENSATORY EDUCATION

November, 1967

Prepared by Elizabeth M. Tapscott

UD 009 324

STATE OF HAWAII

BOARD OF EDUCATION
1966-1970

Dr. Richard E. Ando (Chairman), Honolulu
Rev. Robert C. Loveless (Vice Chairman), Oahu-At-Large
Mr. George S. Adachi, Leeward Oahu
Mr. John B. Connell, Windward Oahu
Mr. Ronald Harker, Kauai
Mr. Eugene Harrison, Central Oahu
Mr. Edwin H. Honda, Oahu-At-Large
Mrs. Myrtle K. Kaapu, Oahu-At-Large
Mr. Kiyoto Tsubaki, Maui
Mrs. Ruth Tabrah, Hawaii
Mr. Hiroshi Yamashita, Hawaii

Mr. Ralph H. Kiyosaki, Superintendent of Education

OFFICE OF INSTRUCTIONAL SERVICES

Dr. C. Richard MacNair, Assistant Superintendent

BRANCH OF COMPENSATORY EDUCATION

Dr. Elizabeth M. Tapscott, Program Director

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	iv
Evaluation Focus	iv
Data Collection	v
Limitations of the Report	v
SUMMARY	vi
Conclusions and Recommendations	vii
MAJOR ACHIEVEMENTS	1
DESCRIPTION OF ACTIVITIES AND METHODS	1
State Educational Agency Services to Local Educational Agencies	1
Most Pressing Educational Needs	3
Most Prevalent Project Objectives	3
Title I Activities and Those of Other Federal Programs	4
Staff Development and Utilization	6
Involvement of Non-Public School Children	7
Programs Designed for Handicapped Children	8
PROBLEMS RESOLVED	9
STATEWIDE TABULAR DATA, TITLE I, ESEA FOR FISCAL YEAR 1967	9
Average Daily Attendance and Average Daily Membership	10
Dropout Rates	12
Standardized Test Results	13
Title I Graduates Continuing Education Beyond High School	32
EFFECTIVE PROJECTS	33
SUPPLEMENTARY DATA	35
Program Effectiveness	35
Dissemination of Information	37
STATISTICAL DATA	38
Number of Participants by Grade Level	38
Number of Staff Members Employed Under Title I	41
Activities, Services, and Expenditures	43

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
I	SERVICES RECEIVED FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION	2
II	SERVICES NEEDED FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION	2
III	RANK ORDER OF THE FIVE MOST PRESSING EDUCATIONAL NEEDS OF DISADVANTAGED CHILDREN IN HAWAII	3
IV	RANK ORDER OF THE FIVE MOST PREVALENT PROJECT OBJECTIVES IN HAWAII	4
V	OTHER PROGRAMS WHICH SUPPLEMENTED TITLE I ACTIVITIES	5
VI	COORDINATION OF TITLE I AND COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS	5
VII	EFFECTIVENESS OF METHODS FOR EXTENDING TIME OF CURRENT STAFF AS A MEANS OF INCREASING STAFF	6
VIII	EFFECTIVENESS OF METHODS FOR EXTENDING STAFF	7
IX	AVERAGE DAILY ATTENDANCE AND AVERAGE DAILY MEMBERSHIP RATES FOR TITLE I PROJECT SCHOOLS COMPARED WITH ALL OTHER PUBLIC SCHOOLS IN THE STATE OF HAWAII	10
X	DROPOUT RATES FOR TITLE I PROJECT SCHOOLS COMPARED WITH ALL OTHER PUBLIC SCHOOLS IN THE STATE	12
XI	STANDARDIZED TEST RESULTS, TITLE I, ESEA, 1966-67	13
XII	STANDARDIZED TEST RESULTS, TITLE I, ESEA, 1966-67 GROUPS TAKING PRE AND/OR POST TESTS	21
XIII	GRADUATES FROM TITLE I PROJECT HIGH SCHOOLS CONTINUING EDUCATION BEYOND HIGH SCHOOL COMPARED WITH ALL OTHER PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOLS IN HAWAII	32
XIV	EFFECTIVENESS OF TITLE I PROJECTS IN MEETING OBJECTIVES	36
XV	TYPES OF EVALUATION DESIGNS USED	36
XVI	RATINGS OF TITLE I PROGRAMS EFFECTIVENESS	37
XVII	TECHNIQUES UTILIZED FOR DISSEMINATING TITLE I INFORMATION	38

TABLE		PAGE
XVIII	TITLE I PARTICIPANTS BY GRADE LEVEL (Including Summer)	38
XIX	SUMMER SCHOOL TITLE I PARTICIPANTS BY GRADE LEVEL	39
XX	SPECIAL PROJECT PARTICIPANTS IN TITLE I, P.L. 89-313	40
XXI	PROGRAM STAFF MEMBERS EMPLOYED AND ESTIMATED TOTAL SALARIES PAID BY TITLE I, ESEA, FOR FISCAL YEAR 1967	41
XXII	TITLE I PROGRAM INSTRUCTIONAL AND SERVICE ACTIVITIES	43
XXIII	TITLE I PROJECT EXPENDITURES FOR FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1967 PROGRAM FOR CHILDREN IN LOW INCOME AREAS	44
XXIV	TITLE I PROJECT EXPENDITURES FOR FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1967 PROGRAM FOR CHILDREN IN SCHOOLS FOR HANDICAPPED CHILDREN	45
XXV	TITLE I PROJECT EXPENDITURES FOR FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1967 PROGRAM FOR CHILDREN IN INSTITUTIONS FOR DELINQUENT CHILDREN . . .	46

INTRODUCTION

In 1965 the United States Congress passed the Elementary and Secondary Education Act which became the Nation's first large-scale attack on the educational deprivation of children of poverty.

The goal of Title I is to provide compensatory education for the millions of school children whose crippling background of poverty offers them little hope for successful schooling. Briefly, the Act provides financial assistance to local schools for special educational programs for disadvantaged children in areas having high concentrations of low-income families. Projects are planned, administered, and executed by local schools after State approval. The Federal government lays down broad guidelines for proper administration of the funds to insure that the money is spent on children of poverty as Congress intended.

The responsibilities for administering Title I programs are on three levels:

Overall conduct of programs is the responsibility of the U. S. Commissioner of Education.

Primary responsibilities, including suballocation of grants, approval of projects, and maintenance of fiscal records rest with the State.

The remaining responsibilities rest with local public schools which are responsible for developing, implementing, and evaluating projects to fulfill the intent of Title I.

Evaluation Focus

Evaluation is a vital aspect of all Title I projects. That evaluation is to be an integral part of the overall program is clearly specified in the Act which states in Section 205 (a) (5) "that effective procedures, including provision for appropriate objective measures of educational achievement, will be adapted for evaluating at least annually the effectiveness of the programs in meeting the special educational needs of educationally deprived children".

The requirement for evaluation is found at four different levels:

Each project must be evaluated by the local public school district that received a Title I grant.

The impact of all Title I projects funded in the State must be evaluated annually by the State Educational Agency.

The U. S. Office of Education must make an annual assessment on a nation-wide basis.

The National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Youth must annually report to the President on the effectiveness of Title I programs.

Out of this evaluation process, hopefully, will come objective data that will provide educators with decision-making capabilities for revising, modifying, and developing programs with increased effectiveness and improved efficiency. More specifically,

what is learned through Title I evaluation processes, may help educators cope with the task of meeting the demands of the increasingly complex role and function of education.

Data Collection

A basic task in Title I evaluation at each of the four levels is the collection of relevant data. In order to collect meaningful information about the Title I projects during the second year of operation, an instrument was developed by the Hawaii Department of Education, Title I Office. This instrument was distributed to each school and district participating in a Title I project. The instrument was composed of three parts. Part I was for obtaining background data on the school and project; Part II for the dissemination of information; and Part III for a comprehensive analysis including statistical information and general data related to objectives, test score data, and program effectiveness.

All projects in the State, 110 regular school year projects, 24 summer projects, and 12 projects for handicapped and delinquent children completed and returned the instrument. This was a 100 percent positive response. The Hawaii annual report includes data from all Title I projects for fiscal year 1967 (school year 1966-67). Assisting in the collection, assembling, and interpretation of the data was Dr. Donald Leton, Chairman, Department of Educational Psychology, University of Hawaii, serving as a consultant to the Title I Office of the Hawaii Department of Education.

Limitations of the Report

This report was prepared at the request of the U. S. Office of Education and the outline form followed as well as the data presented is that which was requested by the U. S. Office of Education. Several occurrences that led to data collection limitations included:

Many projects were submitted without adequate evaluation designs and identification of instruments to be used. Revisions required in these applications caused delay in obtaining adequate baseline data and start of programs.

All data on which this report is based were supplied by the administrators of the local projects based upon their best professional judgment and limited objective test score data.

Many projects were written and submitted at a time when the evaluation reporting procedures were uncertain and, as a result, there was a great variety in the kinds of instruments used to gather the required objective data.

Project staffs were overburdened by other demands of the school and were, in many cases, unaware of the requirement of objective evaluation and/or were unskilled in evaluation techniques and methods and, as a result, some times appreciated evaluation efforts.

Necessary educational materials and equipment were often not delivered until long after the project began. In some projects, pre-testing could not take place until mid way in the program due to shipping delays.

Translation of project objectives into behavioral objectives that would lend themselves to measurement proved to be a major source of trouble.

Post-test score data for projects utilizing the STEP tests from the State Minimum Testing Program were not available at the time the Statewide evaluation report was compiled.

The data compiled in this report have not permitted a treatment that provides for the undetermined inter-relationships of the many variables involved in the various programs. The variety of standardized tests used at all grade levels and the variations in the time between the pre- and post-tests make it impossible to make any valid comparisons. The reader is encouraged to qualify the data in terms of the limitations under which they were collected at the local levels and special caution is urged for not overextending the data.

SUMMARY

There were approximately 17,298 participants in 110 Title I projects during fiscal year 1967. Of this number 2,461 students participated in 24 summer projects funded by Title I. There were an additional 776 handicapped and delinquent students participating in 12 projects funded under amendments to Title I, ESEA. During fiscal year 1967 Hawaii received $2,108,762 under Title I for programs for children of low-income families, $113,393 for children in schools for handicapped and $4,270 for children in institutions for neglected and delinquent children.

The primary focus of Title I programs was upon the improvement of reading and language arts skills of the most deprived pupils in schools where there were large concentrations of children from low-income families.

The most pressing educational needs of the disadvantaged children in Hawaii were: poor performance on standardized tests (language arts), classroom performance significantly below grade level in reading and low level verbal functioning. The most prevalent project objectives, consistent with the identified characteristics or needs of the deprived pupils were: to improve performance in language arts as measured by standardized achievement test, to improve classroom performance in reading beyond usual expectations, and to improve children's verbal functioning.

According to the evaluations of 110 Title I projects, 88 percent of the Title I participants made "substantial" or "some" progress in achieving the objectives of the projects. These evaluations were based upon professional observations, standardized test scores, and teacher-made tests.

On the basis of standardized test score results submitted by 65 of the Title I projects, it was concluded that the majority of the projects did produce achievement gains in reading that were greater than would normally be expected. The interim between pre- and post-test administration varied widely from three to eight months. The academic gains which were typically observed ranged from no demonstrable improvements up to about 1.5 grade level increase. These gains for the first full year of program operation were considered significant because they indicated that rather than falling farther behind in academic achievement, as is the pattern with disadvantaged students, they held their own and in some cases showed an additional gain during the period measured.

The data regarding average daily attendance, dropout rates, and students continuing education beyond high school did not reveal any significant variations in Title I schools and non-Title I schools. This was due to the large size of the heterogeneous high schools, which in Hawaii have a very high rate of holding power.

Hawaii State Expansion Programs were used to supplement and expand Title I activities in approximately one-third of the projects. Other programs which supplemented Title I activities in one-fourth of the projects were the U. S. Department of Agriculture food program, the Welfare programs, and the Neighborhood Youth Corps.

The majority of the Title I projects were reviewed by the Community Action Program or were planned in conference with local CAP officials.

Teacher aides or classroom assistants were employed in more than half of the Title I projects in Hawaii and respondents judged this to be a very useful method for extending staff.

There were approximately 330 non-public school pupils participating in Title I projects. These students were involved in remedial reading, counseling, and summer projects. Local public schools reported the most common reason for non-participation of pupils from non-public schools because they did not meet the criteria of educational deprivation, or the non-public school was not interested in participating.

Hawaii had twelve (12) special programs funded under amendments to Title I for handicapped children and for children in institutions for delinquent children.

A major problem which hinders adequate planning and long-range program development is the lateness in the school year when funding is made by Congress.

The greatest progress in achievement was observed in projects that had the most comprehensive compensatory education programs. Projects which attempted through a single activity to overcome the learning problems caused by poverty usually failed to result in demonstrable achievement gains. A common element of successful comprehensive programs was a lower pupil-teacher ratio, usually accomplished by employment of classroom assistants. However, projects which consisted solely of classroom assistants were generally not as effective in raising student achievement as were the comprehensive programs.

Those schools with small allocations tended to spend less per Title I participant, reflecting an attempt to reach more children with a less comprehensive program. The smaller projects also tended to lack the personnel necessary to plan, implement and evaluate a comprehensive program.

Characteristics of projects in which students showed the greatest achievement gains were those which: employed a remedial reading specialist working with small groups, used several methods and a variety of instructional techniques in teaching reading, and the reading specialist maintained a close liaison with the regular classroom teacher.

Conclusions and Recommendations

When the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 was signed into law, the broad objectives of the program were set:

> Congress hereby declares it to be the policy of the United States to provide financial assistance to local educational agencies serving areas with concentrations of children from low-income families in order to expand and improve their educational programs by various means ... which contribute particularly to meeting the special educationalneeds of educationally deprived children.

On the basis of the evaluations submitted for fiscal year 1967 programs in Hawaii, it was concluded that educational programs have been expanded and improved to meet the special needs of the most educationally disadvantaged children in Hawaii. One of the major impacts of Title I has been to focus attention on the particular needs of the disadvantaged child. This focus has provided educationally deprived children with more individual attention, services and activities in order that they may have an equal opportunity to succeed in school.

Based upon the evaluations and the limited test score data submitted, it was concluded that Title I programs have provided additional educational opportunities for disadvantaged students. As a result of these expanded opportunities, the Title I participants have shown gains in achievement which are greater than would be anticipated in the normal school program. In-service training for Title I staffs has been a useful technique for changing teachers' attitudes and methods of working with disadvantaged pupils. According to the evaluations submitted by the local administrators, lesser impact has been made on the community and the home in terms of their attitude toward education and the disadvantaged.

It is recommended that there be a greater concentration of services and activities for the most disadvantaged in order that the initial gains in achievement reported for this year may be continued and increased. It is also recommended that there be greater community and family involvement if the projects are to achieve maximum effectiveness. A third recommendation, which is already being implemented, is to provide statewide objective evaluation of the most common objectives in order that these data can be treated statistically to provide a more comprehensive objective assessment of project outcomes.

1. MAJOR ACHIEVEMENTS

Major achievements under Title I of statewide significance in educating disadvantaged children were:

A. The statewide focus upon improving the Reading-Language Arts skills of pupils resulted in significant gains for educationally deprived pupils. These gains were reflected on standardized achievement tests, attendance records, teachers' grades and assessments, and improved attitudes on the part of participants.

B. In-service training of teachers and administrators in program design and evaluation helped provide them with skills necessary for evaluating the effectiveness of various programs.

C. Throughout the State, there was greater concentration of funds and programs for providing services for the most deprived children. As a result of this higher concentration, programs were designed and implemented to more closely meet the specific needs of the most deprived children.

D. Teachers and administrators gained greater competencies through in-service training in the identification of the most deprived children and their special needs.

2. DESCRIPTION OF ACTIVITIES AND METHODS

A survey of the activities and procedures in local projects provided objective and opinion data for this report. Questionnaire responses were obtained from all 110 project coordinators of programs conducted during the school year. Additional reports were received from the 24 summer project coordinators and 12 coordinators of projects for handicapped children.

A. State Educational Agency Services to Local Educational Agencies

The amount of assistance received by local coordinators is indicated in Table I. Almost 50 percent of them reported receiving "Some" or "Considerable" assistance in this area with only about 15 percent receiving no assistance.

In project implementation, which included financial and administrative procedures, more assistance was received by the local agencies in financial procedures than in the administrative area.

As also shown on Table I, the majority of schools reported they received "Considerable" or "Some" assistance in the evaluation of projects. The area in which they reported they received the greatest amount of assistance was in the project approval.

Table II reveals that "Some" or "Considerable" more help is needed by the majority of local educational agencies in project development and design, operational techniques, approval of projects, and financial and administrative procedures.

TABLE I

SERVICES RECEIVED FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

SERVICE	AMOUNT RECEIVED			
	None (0%)	Little (1-24%)	Some (25-49%)	Considerable (50-100%)
Project development & design (and/or guidelines)	7	45	33	21
Operational techniques (and/or operational guidelines)	10	40	37	17
Evaluation and/or evaluation guidelines	7	33	39	28
Approval of projects	3	25	32	46
Financial procedures	9	31	35	30
Administrative procedures	13	38	34	18
Other	3	4	2	2

Almost fifty percent of the project coordinators responded that they needed "Some" assistance in project evaluation whereas an equal percent reported they needed "Little" or "No" assistance in evaluation.

TABLE II

SERVICES NEEDED FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

SERVICE	AMOUNT NEEDED			
	None (0%)	Little (1-24%)	Some (25-49%)	Considerable (50-100%)
Project development & design (and/or guidelines)	3	28	36	38
Operational techniques (and/or operational guidelines)	10	24	37	34
Evaluation and/or evaluation guidelines	18	36	54	2
Approval of projects	3	18	32	53
Financial procedures	2	23	45	36
Administrative procedures	9	31	36	28
Other	1	2	5	4

B. Most Pressing Educational Needs

Table III indicates that the most pressing educational needs are common to kindergarten, elementary, and secondary school pupils in the State. Data, which formed the basis for identification of these needs, were obtained from the State Minimum Testing Program, individual diagnostic tests, teacher recommendation, and attendance records. The poor performance on standardized tests and in reading was primarily identified through the State Testing Program in which it was shown that the Title I participants achieved significantly below both local and national norms in reading and language arts.

TABLE III

RANK ORDER OF THE FIVE MOST PRESSING EDUCATIONAL NEEDS OF DISADVANTAGED CHILDREN IN HAWAII

EDUCATIONAL NEED	Grade Level*	No. of Projects	No. of Children
Poor performance on standardized tests	K, E, S	65	10,010
Classroom performance significantly below grade level in reading	K, E, S	65	7,735
Low level in verbal functioning	K, E, S	51	6,630
Negative attitude toward school and education	K, E, S	29	5,394
Negative self-image	K, E, S	21	1,932

*K=Kindergarten
E=Elementary (Gr. 1-6)
S=Secondary (Gr. 7-12)

C. Most Prevalent Project Objectives

The rank order of the five common objectives is presented in Table IV. The most common objectives of Title I programs were to improve performance as measured by standardized achievement tests, reported as the first or second objective by forty-seven respondents, and to improve classroom performance in reading beyond usual expectations, reported by forty-two respondents. As might be anticipated, it was found that there was a high correlation between the needs of the deprived children and the program objectives.

TABLE IV

RANK ORDER OF THE FIVE MOST PREVALENT
PROJECT OBJECTIVES IN HAWAII

OBJECTIVE	First Objective	Second Objective	Total
To improve performance as measured by standardized achievement tests	37	10	47
To improve classroom performance in reading beyond usual expectations.	26	16	42
To improve children's verbal functioning.	11	19	30
To change (in a positive direction) their attitudes toward school and education.	11	10	21
To improve the children's self-image.	10	6	16

D. Title I Activities and Those of Other Federal Programs

Hawaii project reports revealed that thirty-eight Title I programs were supplemented with State Expansion funds, which enabled the programs to provide services to more disadvantaged children in other and the same grades, to provide follow up programs for preschool children, to supply funds for salaries of specialist in reading and language arts, and for additional teachers to reduce class size in schools with large numbers of deprived children. The next most commonly found source of support which supplemented Title I programs, as shown on Table V, was the Federal Food Program and the Welfare Administration Programs. There were nineteen projects in which free lunches as well as medical and social services were provided. The Neighborhood Youth Corps Porgram was used to supplement Title I programs in eighteen projects. Title II, P. L. 89-10, funds were reported used in thirteen projects to obtain library materials for implementing their programs.

For the 110 reports, 99 of the respondents indicated there was a Community Action Program (CAP) serving the school area. Of these, 82 reported that the CAP personnel were involved in the design and planning of Title I programs, as shown on Table VI. The majority of projects reported the cooperation they received was in the form of project review and joint planning. In the identification of pockets of poverty, 25 respondents reported they received CAP assistance and 23 respondents reported the CAP program was coordinated with the Title I program.

TABLE V

OTHER PROGRAMS WHICH SUPPLEMENTED TITLE I ACTIVITIES

OTHER PROGRAMS	No. of Projects Supplemented
State Expansion Programs (Hawaii)	38
U. S. Department of Agriculture (Food Program)	19
Welfare Administration Programs	19
Neighborhood Youth Corps	18
Title II, P. L. 89-10	13
Social Security Act, Title 19	8
Act IV (Hawaii)	7
Teacher Corps	5
Job Corps	5
Title III, P. L. 89-10	2
Title IV, P. L. 89-10	0
Title V, P. L. 89-10	0
Other	23

TABLE VI

COORDINATION OF TITLE I AND COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS

	Yes	No
Community Action Program (CAP) serving school area?	99	10
Personnel from CAP involved in design and planning Title I program?	82	23

Type of Cooperation	Number of Projects
CAP reviewed Title I project	62
Title I project planned in conference with CAP	53
CAP assisted in identifying pockets of poverty	25
CAP program coordinated with Title I program	23
CAP assited in locating project participants	21
CAP assisted in recruiting sub-professionals for Title I projects	17
CAP assisted in implementing Title I program	12
Other	6

E. Staff Development and Utilization

The methods used to extend staff time and the judgments of their effectiveness are shown in Table VII. As reported by 110 coordinators, the most effective method for extending the time of the current staff as a means of increasing their Title I staff was through the use of after school time. Few respondents reported using their regular staff for evening or Saturday programs. Summer school utilization of staff was reported "Not Used" by forty of the respondents but as "Useful" and "Very Useful" by seventeen respondents utilizing this technique.

TABLE VII

EFFECTIVENESS OF METHODS FOR EXTENDING TIME OF CURRENT STAFF AS A MEANS OF INCREASING STAFF

METHOD	Not Used	Slightly Useful	Useful	Very Useful
Before School	42	13	4	7
After School	30	11	30	10
Evenings	47	5	5	4
Saturdays	44	9	5	2
Summer School	40	1	10	7
Other	20	-	-	5

In other attempts to increase the Title I staff, respondents reported they extended their regular staff by employing lay persons as aides and assistants as shown on Table VIII. It was noted that of the 74 respondents employing this technique, 44 indicated they found this "Very Useful"; 22 found it "Useful"; and 8 indicated that it was a "Slightly Useful" technique. One of the methods least utilized was that of recruiting new teachers with 8 projects trying this approach and half of them judged it to be only "Slightly Useful".

Of 97 respondents reporting, 80 provided in-service training for teachers working with the disadvantaged. Of the 80 which reported they did provide in-service training, 16 rated this as a "Slightly Useful" method; 41 reported it "Useful"; and 23 indicated that it was "Very Useful". University consultants and district staff specialists provided the in-service training for the majority of the projects.

TABLE VIII

EFFECTIVENESS OF METHODS FOR EXTENDING STAFF

METHOD	Not Used	Slightly Useful	Useful	Very Useful
Use of lay persons as aides and assistants	17	8	22	44
Use of non-educational professional persons	35	6	17	5
Recruitment of social workers	44	2	5	4
Recruitment of new teachers	48	4	3	1
Recruitment of teachers who had dropped out of teaching profession	47	2	1	1
Other	11	2	5	4

F. Involvement of Non-Public School Children

1. The most effective activities in which non-public school children participated under Title I were in the summer programs. A second effective method of providing for non-public school pupils was in the counseling and tutoring projects. A third activity which was effective was the involvement of eligible non-public school pupils in remedial programs.

   A method employed by the State educational agency to stimulate the involvement of the non-public school pupils was to invite representatives of the non-public school pupils to large meetings to explain the provisions of the Act. The most effective method was to conduct small area meetings invovling both public and non-public school personnel to discuss possible programs and ways in which all deprived children might best be served.

2. The most commonly funded types of projects were:

   Guidance and tutoring programs in which the non-public schools identified the eligible pupils who then received the special services of the counselor or the tutor. This particular approach was effective as it permitted services to be rendered after school and on weekends. The summer projects were the most effective in terms of non-public school involvement as it did provide for the non-public school pupils' full time participation in special activities with public school pupils. A third type of program provided the services of a remedial teacher to work with identified non-public school pupils on the non-public school premises. Many non-public school teachers working with disadvantaged students participated in public school in-service programs.

Of 109 Title I respondents reporting, 50 indicated there was a non-public school located in the public school attendance area. Of these, 20 reported there were non-public school pupils participating in the Title I projects. A total of 331 non-public school pupils participated in Title I programs. There was an average number of 20 pupils in each of the projects. The range of non-public school pupils was from 2 to 70 in Title I projects.

Of the 59 respondents which reported no involvement of non-public school participants, 14 indicated the pupils did not meet the criteria of educational deprivation and 24 reported the non-public school was not interested in participating.

G. Programs Designed for Handicapped Children

Under regular Title I funding, a special education class was implemented for fifteen disadvantaged children who were classified as dull normal or mentally retarded. A special education teacher was employed to implement a program designed to improve language arts by gearing activities to their interest level. In another project for handicapped, a Traveling Teacher in Special Education was employed to work with 170 handicapped children and their teachers to provide information on current techniques in diagnosis and remediation.

There were twelve projects funded under P. L. 89-313 for handicapped, neglected, and delinquent children. Of the twelve respondents reporting, it was found that the majority of them needed some assistance in project approval and fiscal procedures. They also reported that they received "Considerable" or "Some" help in approval of projects, administrative procedures and operational techniques but received only "Some" assistance in evaluation.

The most common characteristics of the participants were:

Mentally retarded
Deaf
Crippled
Seriously Emotionally Disturbed
Visually Handicapped

The most prevalent project objectives were:

To improve the children's emotional and social stability
To increase their expectations of school
To improve classroom performance and other skill areas beyond usual expectations
To reduce the rate and severity of disciplinary problems

No other Federal programs were used to supplement the Title I programs.

As in the regular Title I projects, the special projects reported the use of lay persons as the most effective means of extending their staff. There were no non-public school pupils participating in the twelve special projects for handicapped children.

3. PROBLEMS RESOLVED

A. Major Problems:

A major problem during the year was the use of Title I funds to include too many children in the program with the result that no real impact would be made. This problem was partially solved by requiring schools to limit the numbers of Title I participants so that approximately $200 was the average per pupil expenditure of Title I funds in each project.

Another major problem was the lack of experience and training of local school personnel in objectively evaluating Title I programs' effectiveness. A seminar and several workshops were held throughout the State, utilizing consultants to assist school personnel, in developing more adequate evaluation designs and techniques.

A third major problem was that of the non-public school participation in Title I programs. A series of meetings were held throughout the State, involving both public and non-public school administrators, and discussions were held concerning the requirements of the Act. Suggestions to effectively implement these requirements were presented.

B. Major Problems Requiring Legislative Changes:

A major problem in administering the Title I program was the timing of Congressional appropriations. The level of funding was not known until middle of the current year of the program. It was difficult for school budgets and programs to be planned for greatest effectiveness with the uncertainty over the level of funding for current and succeeding years. Long range planning, which is essential to the success of the program, was almost impossible with the present lack of information on funding. This could only be changed by Federal law.

Another problem which could only be changed by legislation was that of inadequate funding. With increased costs and teacher increments, it was virtually impossible to continue programs at the same level of funding as for previous years. There needs to be more funds available for planning, evaluation and in-service education.

Another problem encountered in the present level of support was that of funding for summer programs. Supplementary Congressional appropriations for summer programs would be one way in which this problem could be resolved.

4. STATEWIDE TABULAR DATA, TITLE I, ESEA FOR FISCAL YEAR 1967

As shown on Table IX, the percentage of average daily attendance and average daily membership in relation to the total enrollment in Title I schools in 1964-65 prior to Title I funding was high, .912. The percentage for non-Title I schools was only slightly higher, .982, for the same period. It was noted that during the past year, the percentage of average daily attendance increased more in Title I schools than in non-Title I schools. Because the Statewide percentage was so high, it was difficult to assess the significance of the improvement of attendance in the effect of Title I on the attendance of pupils in the Title I schools. (Information obtained from Office of Research, Hawaii Department of Education.)

TABLE IX

AVERAGE DAILY ATTENDANCE AND AVERAGE DAILY MEMBERSHIP RATES FOR TITLE I PROJECT SCHOOLS COMPARED WITH ALL OTHER PUBLIC SCHOOLS IN THE STATE OF HAWAII*

GRADE	1964 - 1965				1965 - 1966				1966 - 1967			
	All Title I Schools		All Other Public Schools		All Title I Schools		All Other Public Schools		All Title I Schools		All Other Public Schools	
	ADA	ADM	ADA	ADM	ADA	ADM	ADA	ADM	ADA	ADM	ADA	ADM
7 - 12	35567	38123	26583	27965	37877	40486	24431	25874	33966	36461	31078	32946
1 - 6	33569	36049	43628	45899	32960	35136	43139	45673	31798	33672	46977	49032
Kindergarten	5318	6030	6936	7452	5468	6110	6746	7516	5236	5784	7605	8223
Totals	74454	80202	77147	81316	76305	81732	74316	79063	71000	75917	85660	90201
Percent in proportion to total enrollment	.912	.982	.976	1.00	.915	.980	.943	1.00	.932	.996	.949	.999
Total Public School Enrollment as of December, 1966	81626		79055		83373		78791		76155		90220	

*There were no schools in which 1/3 or more of the student enrollment participated in Title I programs.

Title I programs have had no appreciable effect upon the dropout rate in Hawaii, according to the data as presented in Table X. Because of the extremely high holding power of the schools in the State, any decrease in the dropout rate would represent a minimum percentage of total enrollment. It was noted in several of the individual project evaluation reports that there were many individual cases of pupils who were retained in school as a direct result of the Title I programs. (Information obtained from the Special Services Branch, Hawaii Department of Education.)

The standardized test results for individual projects are reported in Table XI, pages 13-20. A number of projects seeking other behavioral objectives, such as improving attitudes toward school or improving school attendance, did not use standardized test results. Some projects also used only one standardized test during the course of the project. The choice of standardized tests, teacher-made tests or of ratings to evaluate the attainment of project objectives was at the discretion of the local school and district.

Because of the limited numbers of students in the projects reporting test data, and because of the large pre- and post-test variances, the statistical significance of the achievement gains in each project were not tested.

Tables XII-A through XII-K, pages 21-31, present the test data at each grade level for projects using the same achievement test. The three most commonly used tests were Gates Reading, CAT, and STEP. The amounts of achievement gain, as measured by the standardized tests, were apparent by inspection of pre-and post-test results. Because of the differences in testing dates and differences in reporting scores, the combining of project results to obtain larger samples for statistical analysis were not feasible. These limitations, which precluded the combining of project results, will be changed in the 1967-1968 projects by administering similar tests in projects which have similar objectives and centralizing some of the achievement evaluations.

A few interpretive statements can be made about the reading achievement gains observed in the 1966-1967 projects. There were a few projects in which expected achievement gains were not demonstrated. The majority of the projects, however, showed achievement gains greater than would be anticipated through normal school progress. The interim between pre- and post-test administration varied widely from three to eight months. The academic gains which were typically observed ranged from no demonstrable improvements up to about 1.5 grade level increase. If such gains pervaded in all achievement areas and persisted for several years, these students would obviously not continue to be classified as educationally disadvantaged.

TABLE X

DROPOUT RATES FOR TITLE I PROJECT SCHOOLS
COMPARED WITH ALL OTHER PUBLIC SCHOOLS IN THE STATE

GRADE	1963-1964		1964-1965		1965-1966		1966-1967	
	All Title I Schools	All Other Public Schools	All Title I Schools	All Other Public Schools	All Title I Schools	All Other Public Schools	All Title I Schools	All Other Public Schools
12	144	78	165	58	143	72	136	60
11	259	106	235	89	215	102	244	86
10	286	122	243	112	255	71	256	81
9	95	56	107	79	103	71	98	49
8	41	16	39	10	38	21	42	10
7	11	3	12	7	14	10	30	7
Total No. of Dropouts	836	381	801	355	768	347	806	293
*Total No. of Students	35070	27397	35260	28667	35124	30374	35623	32846
% of Dropouts	.024	.014	.023	.012	.022	.011	.023	.009
No. of Schools	52	45	52	44	49	42	49	40

*Total number of students enrolled in Grades 7-12.

TABLE XI

STANDARDIZED TEST RESULTS, TITLE I, ESEA, 1966-67

Project Number	NAME OF TEST OR SUBTEST	PRE-TEST SCORE RESULTS (individual scores)									POST TEST SCORE RESULTS								
		Mo. & Yr. Administered	Form	No. of Students	Raw Score or Grade Placement Mean	Standard Deviation	25th %ile and below	26th-50th %ile	51st-75th %ile	76th %ile and above	Mo. & Yr. Administered	Form	No. of Students	Raw Score or Grade Placement Mean	Standard Deviation	25th %ile and below	26th-50th %ile	51st-75th %ile	76th %ile and above
001	Stanford Achievement Gr. 1	1/67																	
	Stanford Achievement Gr. 2	1/67																	
	Iowa Test of Basic Skills	1/67																	
003	Frostig Test of Vis. Perc.	10/66		15			15				5/66		14			14	1		
	Peabody Picture Vocabulary	12/66	B	46			46				5/66	A	44			44	2		
	Gates Reading Survey	1/67	M1	40			40				6/67	M2	37			37	3		
004	Stanford Ach. Prim. Batt.	2/67	X	40	2.1		13	21	6		6/67	X	40	2.7		6	11	13	10
	Gray Oral	2/67	A	40	1.9						6/67	A	40	3.1					
	Wide Range Achievement	2/67		40	2.5						6/67		40	3.7					
007	STEP Reading Gr. 6	10/66		10			9	1											
	STEP Reading Gr. 4	10/66		12			11	1											
008	STEP Reading Gr. 4	9/66		14	229		12	2											
	STEP Reading Gr. 6	9/66	4B	12	241		8	4											
010	Gates Basic Reading Gr. 8	1/67	RV1	11	29		7	4			5/67	RV2	11	35		7	4		
		1/67	LC1	11	24		11				5/67	LC2	11	25		11			
011	Gates Reading Gr. 8	2/66	1	19	4.0														
		2/67	2	18	4.3						5/67	1	19	4.7					
	Gates Reading Gr. 9	2/66	1	28	5.0														
		2/66	1	20	4.0														
		2/67	2	30	5.7						5/67	1	31	5.6					
		2/66	2	22	4.6						5/67	1	22	4.9					
	Gates Reading Gr. 10	2/66	1	22	4.2														
		2/67	2	25	4.9						5/67	1	28	5.6					

TABLE XI (Continued)

STANDARDIZED TEST RESULTS, TITLE I, ESEA, 1966-67

Project Number	NAME OF TEST OR SUBTEST	PRE-TEST SCORE RESULTS									POST TEST SCORE RESULTS								
		Mo. & Yr. Administered	Form	No. of Students	Raw Score or Grade Placement Mean	Standard Deviation	25th %ile and below	26th-50th %ile	51st-75th %ile	76th %ile and above	Mo. & Yr. Administered	Form	No. of Students	Raw Score or Grade Placement Mean	Standard Deviation	25th %ile and below	26th-50th %ile	51st-75th %ile	76th %ile and above
011 (contd)	Gates Reading Gr. 11	2/66	1	16	4.7														
		2/67	2	19	5.2						5/67	1	19	5.7					
	Gates Reading Gr. 12	2/66	1	20	5.6														
		2/67	2	19	6.0						5/67	1	20	6.2					
014	CAT, CTMM, STEP	(Gain scores not computed)																	
016	Bond, Clymer & Hoyt Gr. 7	10/66	DA	43	3.38						5/67	DA	51	4.01					
	Bond, Clymer & Hoyt Gr. 8	10/66	DA	43	4.23						5/67	DA	49	4.80					
017	Slosson Oral Reading	10/66		76															
019	Gates Adv. Prim. Rdg. Gr. 5	2/67	F1	13	21	4.20					5/67	F1	13	23	4.93				
	Gates Adv. Prim. Rdg. Gr. 6	2/67	F1	11	24	3.19					5/67	F1	11	26	3.50				
020	Metropolitan Reading	9/66	A	10	1.05						5/67	B	10	2.07					
021	STEP Gr. 7	10/66	4A	71	230						5/67	4B	71	250					
023	STEP Gr. 4	9/66		14	230														
	STEP Gr. 6	9/66		14	239														
	STEP Gr. 8	9/66		10	256														
024	Dev. Reading Gr. 3	12/66	U-1	4	1.82	.41					5/67	U-2	3	2.47	.45				
	" " Gr. 4	12/67	IRA	9	3.19	.52					5/67	IRB	8	3.65	.46				
	" " Gr. 5	12/67	IRA	11	3.86	.48					5/67	IRB	10	4.19	.79				
	" " Gr. 6	12/66		10	4.27	.38					5/67		10	4.54	.68				
025	Metropolitan Reading Gr. 3	9/66	A	17	1.5	.6					4/67	A	17	1.9	.6				
027	Calif. Ach. Test Gr. 7	12/66	W	10	33.5	11.17	5	3		2	5/67	Z	10	39.9	10.39	6	4		
	Calif. Ach. Test Gr. 8	12/66	W	4	35.0	.11	3	1			5/67	Z	4	48.8	.10	1		3	

TABLE XI (Continued)

STANDARDIZED TEST RESULTS, TITLE I, ESEA, 1966-67

Project Number	NAME OF TEST OR SUBTEST	PRE-TEST SCORE RESULTS: Mo. & Yr. Administered	Form	No. of Students	Raw Score or Grade Placement Mean	Standard Deviation	25th %ile and below	26th-50th %ile	51st-75th %ile	76th %ile and above	POST TEST SCORE RESULTS: Mo. & Yr. Administered	Form	No. of Students	Raw Score or Grade Placement Mean	Standard Deviation	25th %ile and below	26th-50th %ile	51st-75th %ile	76th %ile and above
028	Peabody Picture Voc. Test	10/66	A	90	82.1	8.4					5/67	B	90	86.9	7.6				
029	Stanford Achievement Gr. 7	12/66	W		41						5/67	X		44					
	" " Gr. 8	12/66	W		51						5/67	X		52					
	" " Gr. 9	12/66	W		57						5/67	X		64					
032	SRA Arith. Test Gr. 7	10/66	A	30	10.4	4.8	30				5/67	B	31	13.9	5.6	31			
	Stanford Rdg. Int. II Gr. 7	10/66	W	21	8.7	4.8	21	(Word meaning)			5/67	Y	25	14.4	7.2	24	1	(word meaning)	
	Stanford Rdg. Int. II Gr. 7	10/66	W	21	15.5	5.5	21	(Para. meaning)			5/67	Y	25	21.3	8.9	22	3	(para. meaning)	
036	Durrell-Sullivan Gr. 5	2/67	A	7	4.8						6/67	B	7	4.9					
	" " Gr. 6	2/67	A	7	5.5						6/67	B	7	6.1					
	" " Gr. 7	2/67	A	10	5.2						6/67	B	10	5.3					
	" " Gr. 8	2/67	A	4	5.6						6/67	B	4	6.0					
043	Gilmore Gr. 3	2/67	A	16	2.1						6/67	B	16	2.4					
	" Gr. 4	2/67	A	5	2.8						6/67		5	4.2					
	" Gr. 5	2/67	A	6	4.7						6/67		6	6.3					
	" Gr. 6	2/67	A	9	4.0						6/67		9	4.7					
046	Metropolitan Readiness Gr. 1	9/66	R	25	52	18.0					6/67	R	34	38.5	6.9				
	CAT Gr. 2	10/66	X	13	17.9	15.5					5/67	X	13	36.6	6.1				
	" Gr. 3	4/67	W	12	23	8.9					6/67	W	13	58	13.2				
	STEP Gr. 4	9/66	4A	17	227	3.0					6/67	4A	20	235	5.4				
	" Gr. 5	1/67	4A	15	237	4.0					5/67	4A	18	245	4.2				
	" Gr. 6	9/66	4B	15	237	3.6					6/67	4B	15	246	7.5				
047	Gates Adv. Prim. Rdg. Gr. 4	2/67	F1	11	17	4.7					5/67	F1	11	20	3.9				

TABLE XI (Continued)

STANDARDIZED TEST RESULTS, TITLE I, ESEA, 1966-67

			PRE-TEST SCORE RESULTS									POST TEST SCORE RESULTS								
Project Number	NAME OF TEST OR SUBTEST	Mo. & Yr. Administered	Form	No. of Students	Raw Score or Grade Placement Mean	Standard Deviation	25th %ile and below	26th-50th %ile	51st-75th %ile	76th %ile and above	Mo. & Yr. Administered	Form	No. of Students	Raw Score or Grade Placement Mean	Standard Deviation	25th %ile and below	26th-50th %ile	51st-75th %ile	76th %ile and above
048	Nelson Rdg. Test Gr. 7	9/66	A	59	55		41	12	4		5/67	B	58	57		21	16	13	7
	Nelson Rdg. Test Gr. 8	9/66	A	17	40		17				5/67	B	14	51		14			
049	Gates Basic Rdg. Gr. 7-8-9	10/66		86	31.8						6/67		86	32.9					
050	Gates Prim. Rdg. Word Gr. 2	10/66		12	8.4		6	6			5/67		8	26		5	2	1	
051	Gates MacGinitie Gr. 4	10/66	D1	1	22	(Voc. & Comp.)	1				5/67	D2	1	21	Voc.		1		
														27	Comp.)				
	Gates MacGinitie Gr. 5	10/66	D1	9	179	(Voc.)	7	1	1	1	5/67	D2	9	213	Voc.	5	2	1	1
					152	(Comp.)	7	1						247	Comp.)	4	4		
	Gates MacGinitie Gr. 6	10/66	D1	12	227	(Voc.)	11	1			5/67	D2	12	269	Voc.	11	1		
					235	(Comp.)	13							294	Comp.)	11	2		
052	CAT Reading Gr. 3	10/66	X	13	25	3.7					5/67	W	13	50	7.0				
	Gates Adv. Gr. 4	10/66		21	9	3.7					5/67		19	14	3.6				
	Gates Svy. Gr. 5	10/66	M1	13	10	4.5					5/67	M2	11	20	8.0				
	Gates Svy. Gr. 6	10/66	M1	7	13	6.7					5/67	M2	7	30	8.3				
053	STEP Reading Gr. 4	9/66	4A	14	12.9	3.0					6/67	4A	14	20.5	2.3				
	STEP Reading Gr. 5	9/66	4A	17	23.1	3.4					6/67	4A	17	28.6	5.6				
	STEP Reading Gr. 6	9/66	4B	21	28.1	3.9					6/67	4B	21	34.9	4.9				
054	Gates	11/66	M1	43							5/67	M2	43	.9	G. Pl.	mean	gain		
055	Calif. Reading Ach. Gr. 7	11/66					20	12	0		5/67					13	17	2	
	Gates	11/66					9	9	5		5/67					2	15	6	
059	Silent Rdg. Diag. Test	10/67	D	6	4.8	G.Pl.					5/67		6	5.4	G. Pl.				

TABLE XI (Continued)

STANDARDIZED TEST RESULTS, TITLE I, ESEA, 1966-67

Project Number	NAME OF TEST OR SUBTEST	PRE-TEST SCORE RESULTS: Mo. & Yr. Administered	Form	No. of Students	Raw Score or Grade Placement Mean	Standard Deviation	25th %ile and below	26th-50th %ile	51st-75th %ile	76th %ile and above	POST TEST SCORE RESULTS: Mo. & Yr. Administered	Form	No. of Students	Raw Score or Grade Placement Mean	Standard Deviation	25th %ile and below	26th-50th %ile	51st-75th %ile	76th %ile and above
060	STEP Reading Gr. 4	9/65	4A	114	243	13.4	25	25											
	STEP Listening Gr. 5	2/65	4A	120	266	14.8	30	40											
	STEP Reading Gr. 6	9/65	4B	123	265	18.5	30	20											
	SCAT Verbal Gr. 6	9/65	4B	123	255	12.3	20	20											
061	Metropolitan Readiness	9/66	A	16	20	4.3	11	5			5/67	A	16	69	5.6	1		9	6
065	Vineland Social Age	2/67	X	9	4.2	.2					5/67	X	9	4.9	.1				
	Mecham Language Age	2/67	X	9	3.0	.6					5/67	X	9	4.4	.4				
067	California Reading Gr. 5-12	11/66	Y	17	33.5		15	2			11/66	Z	17	38.3		14	3		
	California Language Gr. 5-12	5/67	W	17	32.2		17	0			5/67	X	17	33.2		13	4		
068	CAT Reading Gr. 4	9/66	X	8							6/66	X	8	Mean Gain = .6 G. Pl.					
	CAT Reading Gr. 5	9/66	X	5							6/67	X	5	Mean Gain = 1.0 G. Pl.					
	CAT Reading Gr. 6	9/66	X	12							6/66	X	12	Mean Gain = 1.0 G. Pl.					
071	CAT Reading Gr. 2	9/66	X	6	1.1						5/67	W	6	1.7					
	CAT Reading Gr. 3	9/66	X	8	1.7						5/67	W	8	2.3					
	CAT Reading Gr. 4	9/66	Z	5	3.0						5/67	W	5	3.7					
	CAT Reading Gr. 5	9/66	Z	6	3.4						5/67	W	6	4.4					
	CAT Reading Gr. 6	9/66	Z	9	4.0						5/67	W	9	4.2					
074	STEP (Pretest only)																		
077	California Rdg. Gr. 3	11/66	W	21	42.3	10.0					5/67	W	21	44.7	10.0				
	California Rdg. Gr. 4	11/66	W	20	40.1	10.0					5/67	W	20	45.9	10.0				
	California Rdg. Gr. 5	11/66	Z	23	40.1	10.0					5/67	Z	23	39.6	10.0				
078	Gates Reading Survey Gr. 9-12	9/66									5/67			.9	G. Pl. mean gain				
079	Stanford Ach. Gr. 2	1/67	W	30	1.6		30	0	0	0	5/67	W	30	1.8		18	12	0	0

TABLE XI (Continued)

STANDARDIZED TEST RESULTS, TITLE I, ESEA, 1966-67

Project Number	NAME OF TEST OR SUBTEST	PRE-TEST SCORE RESULTS: Mo. & Yr. Administered	Form	No. of Students	Raw Score or Grade Placement Mean		Standard Deviation	25th %ile and below	26th-50th %ile	51st-75th %ile	76th %ile and above	POST TEST SCORE RESULTS: Mo. & Yr. Administered	Form	No. of Students	Raw Score or Grade Placement Mean		Standard Deviation	25th %ile and below	26th-50th %ile	51st-75th %ile	76th %ile and above
079	Stanford Ach. Gr. 3	1/67	W	29	2.1		27	2	0	0		5/67	W	29	2.7		17	12	0	0	
(contd	Stanford Ach. Gr. 4	1/67	W	25	2.9		24	1	0	0		5/67	W	25	3.2		23	2	0	0	
	Stanford Ach. Gr. 5	1/67	W	22	3.6		21	1	0	0		5/67	W	22	4.0		22	0	0	0	
083	Gates Reading Survey Gr. 9	9/66	M3	10	3.9	Speed	10					5/67			6.0	Speed	8		1		
					3.6	Voc.	10					5/67	M1	9	4.3	Voc.	9				
					4.0	Comp.	10								4.5	Comp.	9				
	Gates Reading Survey Gr. 10	9/66	M3	10	4.2	Speed	10					5/67	M1	9	6.5	Speed	8		1		
					4.8	Voc.	10					5/67			5.2	Voc.	9				
	Gates Reading Survey Gr. 11	9/66	M3	5	6.2	Speed	4	1				5/67	M1	9	8.3	Speed	6		1	2	
					5.9	Voc.	5								6.1	Voc.	8	1			
					5.1	Comp.	5								6.1	Comp.	8	1			
084	Prim. Mental Ability Test	1/67		239	(Test scores did not indicate measurable gains)																
	Goodenough-Harris Draw.	1/67		115										14							
	Kuhlman-Anderson Gr. Form A	1/67	A	190																	
	Stanford Achievement	1/67	W	92								5/67	Y	90							
085	CAT Reading Gr. 3	4/66	UP	3			2	1													
	CAT Reading Gr. 4	4/66	UP	8			4	4				5/67	UP	5			2	3			
	CAT Reading Gr. 5	4/66					7	2				5/67					4	4	1		
	CAT Reading Gr. 6	4/66	W				1	1	5												
086	Betts	10/66		18											Ave. gain = 1.53 G. Pl.						
088	Gates-MacGinitie Rdg. Svy.	9/66	2	12								5/67	2	12							
	Vocabulary				12		10	2							14		12				
	Comprehension				13		12								15		12				

TABLE XI (Continued)

STANDARDIZED TEST RESULTS, TITLE I, ESEA, 1966-67

Project Number	NAME OF TEST OR SUBTEST	PRE-TEST SCORE RESULTS: Mo. & Yr. Administered	Form	No. of Students	Raw Score or Grade Placement Mean	Standard Deviation	25th %ile and below	26th-50th %ile	51st-75th %ile	76th %ile and above	POST TEST SCORE RESULTS: Mo. & Yr. Administered	Form	No. of Students	Raw Score or Grade Placement Mean	Standard Deviation	25th %ile and below	26th-50th %ile	51st-75th %ile	76th %ile and above
089	(Listening skills not objectively evaluated.)																		
091	STEP Reading (1965) Gr. 5	9/65	4A	22			22												
093	California Ach. Rdg. Gr. 4	2/67	W	6	34.6		6				6/67	Z	6	44.5		2	4		
	California Ach. Rdg. Gr. 5	2/67	W	6	47.0		5	1			6/67	Z	6	57.8		1	5		
	California Ach. Rdg. Gr. 6	2/67	W	6	60.1		6				6/67	Z	5	69.4		3	2		
094	Cal. Ach. Rdg. & Lang. Gr. 7	2/67	X	21	5.9		9	9	3	0	7/67	W	21	7.0		4	8	6	3
	" " " " Gr. 8	2/67	X	25	7.3		11	8	5	1	7/67	W	25	8.1		5	9	7	4
	" " " " Gr. 9	2/67	X	23	7.2		12	11	0	0	7/67	W	23	7.9		8	12	3	0
	" " " " Gr. 10	2/67	X	11	8.4		6	3	1	1	7/67	W	11	9.0		3	6	1	1
	" " " " Gr. 11	2/67	X	9	8.0		7	2	0	0	7/67	W	9	8.1		8	1	0	0
	" " " " Gr. 12	2/67	X	11	11.2		4	3	4	0	7/67	W	11	11.4		4	3	2	2
096	PMA Gr. K										8/67		15	76	16				
	CAT Reading (1-2) Gr. 2	1/67	W	8	29	12.3	8				8/67	X	10	60	12.3	4	5	1	
	" " (H2-L4) Gr. 3	1/67	W	10	22	18.3	10				8/67	X	10	45	18.3	10			
	" " Gr. 4	1/67	W	10	20	22.7	9	1			8/67	Z	10	34	22.7	6	3	1	
	" " Gr. 5	1/67	W	10	39	22.7	8	2			8/67	Z	10	50	22.7	7	3		
097	CAT Reading Gr. 3	12/66	W	8		2.6	3	5	0	0	7/67	X	8		3.4	1	7	0	0
	" " Gr. 4	12/66	W	14		4.3	4	5	2	3	7/67	X	14		4.8	3	4	4	3
	" " Gr. 5	12/66	W	16		4.8	8	2	1	5	7/67	X	16		5.3	6	5	1	4
	" " Gr. 6	12/66	W	11		5.3	3	5	2	1	7/67	X	11		5.7	5	4	1	1
	" " Gr. 7	12/66	W	12		5.5	8	3	1	0	7/67	X	12		7.1	3	6	2	1
	" " Gr. 8	12/66	W	12		6.2	6	5	1	0	7/67	X	12		7.9	4	5	2	1

TABLE XI (Continued)

STANDARDIZED TEST RESULTS, TITLE I, ESEA, 1966-67

Project Number	NAME OF TEST OR SUBTEST	PRE-TEST SCORE RESULTS: Mo. & Yr. Administered	Form	No. of Students	Raw Score or Grade Placement Mean	Standard Deviation	25th %ile and below	26th-50th %ile	51st-75th %ile	76th %ile and above	POST TEST SCORE RESULTS: Mo. & Yr. Administered	Form	No. of Students	Raw Score or Grade Placement Mean	Standard Deviation	25th %ile and below	26th-50th %ile	51st-75th %ile	76th %ile and above
099	Gates Reading Gr. 6	9/66	1	5	3.14 Accuracy						5/67	2	5	4.15 Accuracy					
					3.14 Voc.									4.42 Voc.					
					3.34 Comp.									5.52 Comp.					
	Gilmore Oral Gr. 6	9/66	A	5	2.84 Accuracy						5/67	B	5	4.12 Accuracy					
					3.36 Comp.									4.42 Comp.					
	Gates Reading Gr. 7	9/66	1	13	4.30 Accuracy						5/67	2	13	5.7 Accuracy					
					4.20 Voc.									5.83 Voc.					
					4.05 Comp.									5.82 Comp.					
	Gilmore Oral Gr. 7	9/66	A	13	4.01 Accuracy						5/67	B	13	5.7 Accuracy					
					4.04 Comp.									5.53 Comp.					
	Gates Reading Gr. 8	9/66	1	9	4.66 Accuracy						5/67	2	9	5.88 Accuracy					
					4.06 Voc.									5.76 Voc.					
					3.96 Comp.									5.61 Comp.					
103	Test of Academic Progress	10/66	I	95	29.5			64	30	1	5/67	I	95	50.1			43	52	
104	STEP Reading Gr. 4	9/64	4A	76	19.		49	13	9	5	9/66	4B	76	25		38	20	12	6
	Gates Reading Survey Gr. 6	5/66	Gr6	79	6.6		20	27	20	12	5/67	Gr6	112	6.8		37	41	23	11
105	Gates Adv. Prim. Gr. 4	3/67	1	14	23		3	4	6	1	3/67	3	14	25		3	2	5	4
	Gates Basic Rdg. Gr. 5	3/67	1	15	8		10	4	1	0	3/67	2	15	11		8	5	2	0
	Gates Basic Rdg. Gr. 6	3/67	1	17	12		12	2	2	1	8/67	2	17	13		10	3	3	1
110	Beery Buktenica	10/66		70	91.4	15.9					5/67		70	95.3	15.4				
	Stanford-Binet	10/66		74	94.2	11.7					5/67		74	99.8	12.7				
112	SCAT	10/66	3A	21			6	8	4	2	5/67	3A	19			6	10	1	2
	CAT	10/66	WYX	23	6.3	(Voc.)					5/67	WYX	23	(8.4	Voc.)				
	Coop Math	2/66	X	20			20	0	0	0	5/67	X	21			18	3	0	0

TABLE XII-A

STANDARDIZED TEST RESULTS, TITLE I, ESEA, 1966-67
GROUPS TAKING PRE AND/OR POST TESTS

Grade 2

Project Number	NAME OF TEST OR SUBTEST	PRE-TEST SCORE RESULTS									POST TEST SCORE RESULTS								
		Mo. & Yr. Administered	Form	No. of Students	Raw Score or Grade Placement Mean	Standard Deviation	25th %ile and below	26th-50th %ile	51st-75th %ile	76th %ile and above	Mo. & Yr. Administered	Form	No. of Students	Raw Score or Grade Placement Mean	Standard Deviation	25th %ile and below	26th-50th %ile	51st-75th %ile	76th %ile and above
046	CAT Gr. 2	10/66	X	13	17.9	15.5					5/67	X	13	36.6	6.1				
071	CAT Reading Gr. 2	9/66	X	6	1.1						5/67	W	6	1.7					
096	CAT Reading (1-2) Gr. 2	1/67	W	10	22	18.3	10				8/67	X	10	45	18.3	10			

TABLE XII-B

STANDARDIZED TEST RESULTS, TITLE I, ESEA, 1966-67
GROUPS TAKING PRE AND/OR POST TESTS

Grade 3

Project Number	NAME OF TEST OR SUBTEST	PRE-TEST SCORE RESULTS										POST TEST SCORE RESULTS									
		Mo. & Yr. Administered	Form	No. of Students	Raw Score or Grade Placement Mean	Standard Deviation	25th %ile and below	26th-50th %ile	51st-75th %ile	76th %ile and above		Mo. & Yr. Administered	Form	No. of Students	Raw Score or Grade Placement Mean	Standard Deviation	25th %ile and below	26th-50th %ile	51st-75th %ile	76th %ile and above	
046	CAT Gr. 3	4/67	W	12	23	8.9						6/67	W	13	58	13.2					
052	CAT Reading Gr. 3	10/66	X	13	25	3.7						5/67	W	13	50	7.0					
071	CAT Reading Gr. 3	9/66	X	8	1.7							5/67	W	8	2.3						
077	CAT Reading Gr. 3	11/66	W	21	42.3	10.0						5/67	W	21	44.7	10.0					
085	CAT Reading Gr. 3	4/66	UP	3			2	1													
096	CAT Reading (H2-L4) Gr. 3	1/67	W	10	22	18.3	10					8/67	X	10	45	18.3	10				
097	CAT Reading Gr. 3	12/66	W	8		2.6	3	5	0	0		7/67	X	8		3.4	1	7	0	0	

TABLE XII-C

STANDARDIZED TEST RESULTS, TITLE I, ESEA, 1966-67
GROUPS TAKING PRE AND/OR POST TESTS

Grade 4

Project Number	NAME OF TEST OR SUBTEST	PRE-TEST SCORE RESULTS										POST TEST SCORE RESULTS									
		Mo. & Yr. Administered	Form	No. of Students	Raw Score or Grade Placement Mean	Standard Deviation	25th %ile and below	26th-50th %ile	51st-75th %ile	76th %ile and above		Mo. & Yr. Administered	Form	No. of Students	Raw Score or Grade Placement Mean	Standard Deviation	25th %ile and below	26th-50th %ile	51st-75th %ile	76th %ile and above	
068	CAT Reading Gr. 4	9/66	X	8								6/66	X	8	(Mean Gain = .6 G. Pt.)						
071	CAT Reading Gr. 4	9/66	Z	5	3.0							5/67	W	5	3.7						
077	CAT Reading Gr. 4	11/66	W	20	40.1	10.0						5/67	W	20	45.9	10.0					
085	CAT Reading Gr. 4	4/65	UP	8			4	4				5/67	UP	5			2	3			
093	CAT Reading Gr. 4	2/67	W	6	34.6	6						6/67	Z	6	44.5		2	4			
096	CAT Reading Gr. 4	1/67	W	10	20	22.7	9	1				8/67	Z	10	34	22.7	6	3	1		
097	CAT Reading Gr. 4	12/66	W	14		4.3	4	5	2	3		7/67	X	14		4.8	3	4	4	3	
007	STEP Reading Gr. 4	10/66		12			11	1													
008	STEP Reading Gr. 4	9/66		14	229		12	2													
023	STEP Reading Gr. 4	9/66		14	230																
046	STEP Reading Gr. 4	9/66	4A	17	227	3.0						6/67	4A	20	235	5.4					
053	STEP Reading Gr. 4	9/66	4A	14	12.9	3.0						6/67	4A	14	20.5	2.3					
060	STEP Reading Gr. 4	9/65	4A	114	243	13.4	25	25													
104	STEP Reading Gr. 4	9/64	4A	76	19		49	13	9	5		9/66	4B	76	25		38	20	12	6	
047	Gates Adv. Prim. Rdg. Gr. 4	2/67	F1	11	17	4.7						5/67	F1	11	20	3.9					
051	Gates MacGinitie Gr. 4	10/66	D1	1	22 (Voc.&Comp.)		1					5/67	D2	1	21Voc/27Comp.		1				
052	Gates Adv. Gr. 4	10/66		21	9	3.7						5/67		19	14	3.6					
105	Gates Adv. Prim. Gr. 4	3/67	1	14	23		3	4	6	1		3/67	3	14	25		3	2	5	4	

TABLE XII-D

STANDARDIZED TEST RESULTS, TITLE I, ESEA, 1966-67
GROUPS TAKING PRE AND/OR POST TESTS

Grade 5

Project Number	NAME OF TEST OR SUBTEST	PRE-TEST SCORE RESULTS									POST TEST SCORE RESULTS								
		Mo. & Yr. Administered	Form	No. of Students	Raw Score or Grade Placement Mean	Standard Deviation	25th %ile and below	26th-50th %ile	51st-75th %ile	76th %ile and above	Mo. & Yr. Administered	Form	No. of Students	Raw Score or Grade Placement Mean	Standard Deviation	25th %ile and below	26th-50th %ile	51st-75th %ile	76th %ile and above
067	CAT Reading Gr. 5-12	11/66	Y	17	33.5		15	2			11/67	Z	17	38.3		14	3		
068	CAT Reading Gr. 5	9/66	X	5							6/67	X	5	(Mean Gain =1.0 G. Pl.)					
071	CAT Reading Gr. 5	9/66	Z	6	3.4						5/67	W	6	4.4					
077	CAT Reading Gr. 5	11/66	Z	23	40.1	10.0					5/67	Z	23	39.6	10.0				
085	CAT Reading Gr. 5	4/65					7	2			5/67					4	4	1	
093	CAT Reading Gr. 5	2/67	W	6	47.0		5	1			6/67	Z	6	57.8		1	5		
096	CAT Reading Gr. 5	1/67	W	10	39	22.7	8	2			8/67	Z	10	50	22.7	7	3		
097	CAT Reading Gr. 5	12/66	W	16		4.8	8	2	1	5	7/67	X	16		5.3	6	5	1	4
046	STEP Gr. 5	1/67	4A	15	237	4.0					5/67	4A	18	245	4.2				
053	STEP Gr. 5	9/66	4A	17	23.1	3.4					6/67	4A	17	28.6	5.6				
060	STEP Listening Gr. 5	2/65	4A	120	266	14.8	30	40											
091	STEP Reading (1965) Gr. 5	9/65	4A	22			22												
019	Gates Adv. Prim. Rdg. Gr. 5	2/67	F1	13	21	4.2					5/67	F1	13	23	4.9				
051	Gates MacGinitie Gr. 5	10/66	D1	9	179 (Voc)		7	1	1	1	5/67	D2	9	213 (Voc.)		5	2	1	1
					152 (Comp)		7	1						247 (Comp)		4	4		
052	Gates Survey Gr. 5	10/66	M1	13	10	4.5					5/67	M2	11	20	8.0				
105	Gates Basic Rdg. Gr. 5	3/67	1	15	8		10	4	1	0	3/67	2	15	11		8	5	2	0

TABLE XII-E

STANDARDIZED TEST RESULTS, TITLE I, ESEA, 1966-67
GROUPS TAKING PRE AND/OR POST TESTS

Grade 6

Project Number	NAME OF TEST OR SUBTEST	PRE-TEST SCORE RESULTS										POST TEST SCORE RESULTS									
		Mo. & Yr. Administered	Form	No. of Students	Raw Score or Grade Placement Mean	Standard Deviation	25th %ile and below	26th-50th %ile	51st-75th %ile	76th %ile and above		Mo. & Yr. Administered	Form	No. of Students	Raw Score or Grade Placement Mean	Standard Deviation	25th %ile and below	26th-50th %ile	51st-75th %ile	76th %ile and above	
068	CAT Reading Gr. 6	9/66	X	12								6/66	X	12	Mean Gain = 1.0 G. Yr.						
071	CAT Reading Gr. 6	9/66	Z	9	4.0							5/67	W	9	4.2						
085	CAT Reading Gr. 6	4/66	W				1	1	5												
093	CAT Reading Gr. 6	2/67	W	6	60.1		6					6/67	Z	5	69.4		3	2			
097	CAT Reading Gr. 6	12/66	W	11		5.3	3	5	2	1		7/67	X	11		5.7	5	4	1	1	
007	STEP Reading Gr. 6	10/66		10			9	1													
008	STEP Reading Gr. 6	9/66	4B	12	241		8	4													
023	STEP Gr. 6	9/66		14	239																
046	STEP Gr. 6	9/66	4B	15	237	3.6						6/67	4B	15	246	7.5					
053	STEP Reading Gr. 6	9/66	4B	21	28.1	3.9						6/67	4B	21	34.9	4.9					
060	STEP Reading Gr. 6	9/66	4B	123	265	18.5	30	20													
019	Gates Adv. Prim. Rdg. Gr. 6	2/67	F1	11	24	3.19						5/67	F1	11	26	3.5					
051	Gates MacGinitie Gr. 6	10/66	D1	12	227 (Voc)		11	1				5/67	D2	12	269 (Voc)		11	1			
					235 (Comp)		13								294 (Comp)		11	2			
052	Gates Survey Gr. 6	10/66	M1	7	13	6.7						5/67	M2	7	30	8.3					
099	Gates Reading Gr. 6	9/66	1	5	3.1 (Acc)							5/67	2	5	4.2 (Acc)						
					3.1 (Voc)										4.4 (Voc)						
					3.3 (Comp)										5.5 (Comp)						
104	Gates Reading Survey Gr. 6	5/66	Gr6	79	6.6		20	27	20	12		5/67	Gr6	112	6.8		37	41	23	11	
105	Gates Basic Reading Gr. 6	3/67	1	17	12		12	2	2	1		8/67	2	17	113		10	3	3	1	

TABLE XII-F

STANDARDIZED TEST RESULTS, TITLE I, ESEA, 1966-67
GROUPS TAKING PRE AND/OR POST TESTS

Grade 7

Project Number	NAME OF TEST OR SUBTEST	PRE-TEST SCORE RESULTS										POST TEST SCORE RESULTS									
		Mo. & Yr. Administered	Form	No. of Students	Raw Score or Grade Placement Mean	Standard Deviation	25th %ile and below	26th-50th %ile	51st-75th %ile	76th %ile and above		Mo. & Yr. Administered	Form	No. of Students	Raw Score or Grade Placement Mean	Standard Deviation	25th %ile and below	26th-50th %ile	51st-75th %ile	76th %ile and above	
027	CAT Gr. 7	12/66	W	10	33.5	11.2	5	3		2		5/67	Z	10	39.9	10.4	6	4			
055	CAT Gr. 7	11/66					20	12	0			5/67					13	17	2		
094	CAT Rdg. & Lang. Gr. 7	2/67	X	21	5.9		9	9	3	0		7/67	W	21	7.0		4	8	6	3	
097	CAT Gr. 7	12/66	W	12		5.5	8	3	1	0		7/67	X	12		7.1	3	6	2	1	
021	STEP Gr. 7	10/66	4A	71	230							5/67	4B	71	250						
049	Gates Basic Rdg. Gr. 7-9	10/66		86	31.8							6/67		86	32.9						
099	Gates Reading Gr. 7	9/66	1	13	4.3	(Accuracy)						5/67	2	13	5.7	(Accuracy)					
					4.2	(Voc.)									5.8	(Voc.)					
					4.1	(Comp)									5.8	(Comp)					

TABLE XII-G

STANDARDIZED TEST RESULTS, TITLE I, ESEA, 1966-67
GROUPS TAKING PRE AND/OR POST TESTS

Grade 8

Project Number	NAME OF TEST OR SUBTEST	PRE-TEST SCORE RESULTS										POST TEST SCORE RESULTS									
		Mo. & Yr. Administered	Form	No. of Students	Raw Score or Grade Placement Mean	Standard Deviation	25th %ile and below	26th-50th %ile	51st-75th %ile	76th %ile and above		Mo. & Yr. Administered	Form	No. of Students	Raw Score or Grade Placement Mean	Standard Deviation	25th %ile and below	26th-50th %ile	51st-75th %ile	76th %ile and above	
027	CAT Gr. 8	12/66	W	4	35.0	.1	3	1				5/67	Z	4	48.8	.1	1		3		
094	CAT Rdg. & Lang. Gr. 8	2/67	X	25	7.3		11	8	5	1		7/67	W	25	8.1		5	9	7	4	
097	CAT Gr. 8	12/66	W	12		6.2	6	5	1	0		7/67	X	12		7.9	4	5	2	1	
023	STEP Gr. 8	9/66		10	256																
010	Gates Basic Reading Gr. 8	1/67	RVI	11	29		7	4				5/67	RV2	11	35		7	4			
		1/67	LC1	11	24		11					5/67	LC2	11	25		11				
011	Gates Reading Gr. 8	2/66	1	19	4.0																
		2/67	2	18	4.3							5/67	1	19	4.7						
099	Gates Reading Gr. 8	9/66	1	9	4.7	Accuracy						5/67	2	9	5.9	Accuracy					
					4.1	Voc									5.8	Voc.					
					4.0	Comp.									5.6	Comp					

TABLE XII-H

STANDARDIZED TEST RESULTS, TITLE I, ESEA, 1966-67
GROUPS TAKING PRE AND/OR POST TESTS

Grade 9

Project Number	NAME OF TEST OR SUBTEST	PRE-TEST SCORE RESULTS: Mo. & Yr. Administered	Form	No. of Students	Raw Score or Grade Placement Mean	Standard Deviation	25th %ile and below	26th-50th %ile	51st-75th %ile	76th %ile and above	POST TEST SCORE RESULTS: Mo. & Yr. Administered	Form	No. of Students	Raw Score or Grade Placement Mean	Standard Deviation	25th %ile and below	26th-50th %ile	51st-75th %ile	76th %ile and above
094	CAT Reading & Lang. Gr. 9	2/67	X	23	7.2		12	11	0	0	7/67	W	23	7.9		8	12	3	0
011	Gates Reading Gr. 9	2/66	1	28	5.0														
		2/66	1	20	4.0														
		2/67	2	30	5.7						5/67	1	31	5.6					
		2/66	2	22	4.6						5/67	1	22	4.9					
078	Gates Reading Surv. Gr. 9-12	9/66									5/67			.9	G. Pl. mean gain				
083	Gates Reading Surv. Gr. 9	9/66	M3	10	3.9	Speed	10				5/67			6.0	Speed	8		1	
					3.6	Voc.	10				5/67	M1	9	4.3	Voc.	9			
					4.0	Comp.	10							4.5	Comp.	9			

TABLE XII-I

STANDARDIZED TEST RESULTS, TITLE I, ESEA, 1966-67
GROUPS TAKING PRE AND/OR POST TESTS

Grade 10

Project Number	NAME OF TEST OR SUBTEST	PRE-TEST SCORE RESULTS										POST TEST SCORE RESULTS									
		Mo. & Yr. Administered	Form	No. of Students	Raw Score or Grade Placement Mean	Standard Deviation	25th %ile and below	26th-50th %ile	51st-75th %ile	76th %ile and above		Mo. & Yr. Administered	Form	No. of Students	Raw Score or Grade Placement Mean	Standard Deviation	25th %ile and below	26th-50th %ile	51st-75th %ile	76th %ile and above	
094	CAT Rdg. & Lang. Gr. 10	2/67	X	11	8.4		6	3	1	1		7/67	W	11	9.0		3	6	1	1	
011	Gates Reading Gr. 10	2/66	1	22	4.2																
		2/67	2	25	4.9							5/67	1	28	5.6						
054	Gates	11/66	M1	43								5/67	M2	43	.9	G. Pl. mean gain					
083	Gates Reading Survey Gr. 10	9/66	M3	10	4.2	Speed	10					5/67	M1	9	6.5	Speed	8		1		
					4.8	Voc.	10					5/67			5.2	Voc.	9				

TABLE XII-J

STANDARDIZED TEST RESULTS, TITLE I, ESEA, 1966-67
GROUPS TAKING PRE AND/OR POST TESTS

Grade 11

Project Number	NAME OF TEST OR SUBTEST	PRE-TEST SCORE RESULTS										POST TEST SCORE RESULTS									
		Mo. & Yr. Administered	Form	No. of Students	Raw Score or Grade Placement Mean		Standard Deviation	25th %ile and below	26th-50th %ile	51st-75th %ile	76th %ile and above	Mo. & Yr. Administered	Form	No. of Students	Raw Score or Grade Placement Mean		Standard Deviation	25th %ile and below	26th-50th %ile	51st-75th %ile	76th %ile and above
094	CAT Rdg. & Lang. Gr. 11	2/67	X	9	8.0		7	2	0	0	7/67	W	9	8.1		8	1	0	0		
011	Gates Reading Gr. 11	2/66	1	16	4.7																
		2/67	2	19	5.2						5/67	1	19	5.7							
083	Gates Reading Surv. Gr. 11	9/66	M3	5	6.1	Speed	4	1			5/67	M1	9	8.3	Speed	6		1	2		
					5.9	Voc.	5							6.1	Voc.	8	1				
					5.1	Comp.	5							6.1	Comp.	8	1				

TABLE XII-K

STANDARDIZED TEST RESULTS, TITLE I, ESEA, 1966-67
GROUPS TAKING PRE AND/OR POST TESTS

Grade 12

Project Number	NAME OF TEST OR SUBTEST	PRE-TEST SCORE RESULTS										POST TEST SCORE RESULTS									
		Mo. & Yr. Administered	Form	No. of Students	Raw Score or Grade Placement Mean	Standard Deviation	25th %ile and below	26th-50th %ile	51st-75th %ile	76th %ile and above		Mo. & Yr. Administered	Form	No. of Students	Raw Score or Grade Placement Mean	Standard Deviation	25th %ile and below	26th-50th %ile	51st-75th %ile	76th %ile and above	
094	CAT Rdg. & Lang. Gr. 12	2/67	X	11	11.2		4	3	4	0		7/67	W	11	11.4		4	3	2	2	
011	Gates Reading Gr. 12	2/66	1	20	5.6																
		2/67	2	19	6.0							5/67	1	20	6.2						

TABLE XIII

GRADUATES FROM TITLE I PROJECT HIGH SCHOOLS
CONTINUING EDUCATION BEYOND HIGH SCHOOL COMPARED WITH
ALL OTHER PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOLS IN HAWAII*

	1963-1964		1964-1965		1965-1966		1966-1967	
	All Title I Schools	All Other Public Schools	All Title I Schools	All Other Public Schools	All Title I Schools	All Other Public Schools	All Title I Schools	All Other Public Schools
Total No. of Graduates	Data Not Available		6198	3041	6005	3004	5696	3844
No. of Schools	Data Not Available		22	12	22	10	18	16
Mean Size Of Graduating Class	Data Not Available		283	253	273	300	316	240
No. of Graduates Continuing Education**	Data Not Available		3822	1733	3783	1742	3645	2268
% of Gra- Graduates Continuing Education	Data Not Available		.616	.570	.630	.580	.640	.590

**Estimated - A student is considered to continue his education if he enters one of the following on either a full or part time basis: Post-Graduate High School Course, Junior College, College or University, Vocational, Commercial or Technical Institute, or Nursing School.

*There were no schools in which 1/3 or more of the student enrollment participated in Title I programs.

The accomplishments of the first full year of Title I programs should be carefully assessed over the next few years. Title I programs should be recognized as an operating procedure, a long term treatment that is part of the ongoing school program, rather than a detached experimental list of projects. The results can only be measured over a period of years and by observing the changes in individual pupils as a result of the new treatments rather than an immediate academic spurt. The fact that students tended to achieve slightly more than a month's growth for every month of instruction does not mean that these students reached the achievement norm of their grade level as a result of some seven months of special instruction. It does mean that they have stopped falling behind their classmates as they progress through the grades. To merely reduce the amount they fall behind is in itself a significant gain.

The percentage of graduates continuing education beyond high school in Title I schools is slightly higher than in non-Title I schools as shown on Table XIII. The majority of high schools participating in Title I were large schools with enrollments reflecting large numbers of pupils from both high and low income families. No valid comparisons or conclusions can be drawn concerning the impact of Title I on the graduates continuing education since the data presented are for total school enrollments where the Title I participants comprise only 10 to 20 percent of the total enrollment. (Information obtained from the Office of Research, Hawaii Department of Education.)

5. EFFECTIVE PROJECTS

Remedial Reading Project:

A remedial reading project at Nanaikapono Elementary and Secondary School. The school is located in an area populated predominately by low income families of Hawaiian and part-Hawaiian extraction, along the Eastern coastline of the Island of Oahu, some thirty miles from urban Honolulu. With one of the world's most beautiful beaches, the scene of the world championship surfing contests as background, 120 elementary and 86 secondary pupils were provided with special services of reading specialists working with small groups to improve their reading and language arts skills. A remedial reading center, located on the campus and staffed by three reading specialists, worked during the year to assist these children in overcoming a lack of experiental background and standard English in order that they might improve their reading skills. The project was operated at a total expense of $43,405 or approximately $211 per pupil.

The major objective of the project was to improve the reading performance of participants. A control-experimental group design was sued to measure the gains of first graders in learning and retaining new words. An instrument was devised with the cooperation of a special Bishop Museum study. The experimental group (Title I participants) showed a 90 percent retention while the comparable control group's retention was 69 percent.

Diagnostic reading tests administered to seventh and eighth graders on a pre-post test design revealed measured progress from -.6 to 1.65 grade levels with a mean growth of .60 months for the seven months. This was more growth than would have normally have been anticipated for these students.

Summer Camp Project:

On the Island of Maui, the Garden Island of the State, 36 ten and eleven year old boys and girls from ten of Maui's eligible Title I schools participated in a six-day (24 hours a day) summer camp program located on Lahainaluna School campus. Between 10 and 14 campers attended each of the six one-week sessions. Two excellent instructors served as directors, counselors, chauffers, and teachers to the campers. Three intermediate grade pupils, themselves Title I participants, served as Junior Assistants during the summer camp program. Varied introductions to learning situations were presented to the campers in the form of nature study, arts and crafts, and astronomy. The most effective parts of the summer camp program were the study trips during which campers and assistants learned by listening, discovering, thinking, and doing. Before and after the study trips, some reading was necessary and following the trips children recorded their experiences by tape recordings or writing. The total cost of the program was $4,437 or an average of $123 per participant.

The major objective of the program was to raise the occupational and/or educational aspirational levels of the participants. An evaluation instrument was constructed with consultative assistance from the University of Hawaii. The instrument was designed to gather data concerning the participants' interests of and attitudes toward occupational and/or educational aspirational levels. This instrument was administered the first and last days of the camp. Analysis of pre- and post-test scores found a significant difference at the .05 level of significance in the pre- and post-test scores according to a t test. It was reported that positive gains were made in the attitudes of participants in the summer camp.

Language Arts Enrichment Project:

Konawaena Elementary School, located on the coast of the Island of Hawaii in the coffee growing region, implemented a project designed to improve the reading abilities of 65 pupils in grades kindergarten through grade five. Six half-time classroom assistants were employed to work with teachers who had large concentrations of disadvantaged pupils. The classroom teacher worked with small groups of pupils utilizing programmed materials, SRA reading materials, and tape recording in an attempt to provide the individual instruction most needed by the deprived pupils. In-service training was provided for the classroom assistants and teachers. A pre-test post-test design was used to evaluate the effectiveness of the program. According to the mean raw scores on the California Achievement Tests, pupils in grades one through five, showed an average improvement of 19 points which was a greater improvement than would normally be expected. Pre-test scores showed there were 35 children at the 25th percentile and below and 3 at the 26th-to-50th percentile. Post-test scores indicated there were 11 pupils in the 25th-to-50th percentile range and 2 moved into the 51st-to-75th percentile range.

Compensatory Summer Activities Project:

In urban Honolulu, four hundred and four children from nine public and three non-public schools took part in a half-day program during the six summer weeks. Centers were established at five public schools, staffed by four professional staff members. Fifty percent of the children's day was centered around non-academic activities such as arts and crafts, music, creative dramatics, and

organized recreation. The other fifty percent of the time was concentrated in language arts such as reading, speaking, writing, story telling and group discussions. The approach to language arts was to create a relaxed, non-threatening climate in which all of the activities and stimulations were blended into each other without creating distinct periods for various activities. Major emphasis was in the area of improving oral communications. The total cost of the project was $41,835 for 404 children for the six weeks at an average per pupil cost of $54. The mean growth of these children during the six weeks was 2.5 months according to a pre-post test design utilizing standardized achievement tests.

The objective of the program was to improve the reading skills of the participants. Test score data for the six weeks program showed a mean gain of .26 months in reading achievement.

Due to the extremely short period of time the project was in operation, it was difficult to assess the effectiveness in terms of standardized scores. The evaluation, based on rating scales and observation by the professional staff, revealed that over two-fifths of the participants also made positive progress in improvement of verbal functioning.

Successful Approaches:

The approaches to educate the deprived which proved to be most successful were those which concentrated on providing a series of related services to benefit the most educationally deprived. An example of this type of program was the project which utilized a team approach consisting of remedial reading specialists, counselor or social worker, the regular classroom teacher and teacher aides in providing cultural enrichment, home visitations, and individualized instruction. This approach, rather than a strictly academic remedial program, has produced greater benefits for the Title I recipients. A combination approach involving medical and dental services and academic remediation with extensive cultural enrichment such as has been implemented on the Island of Hawaii has been particularly successful. A major factor which has led to a successful program has been the meaningful and active involvement of parents of those children in the Title I projects. The pre-school programs throughout the State have been extremely successful in giving four-year olds a Head Start in the regular school program, and many Title I programs were implemented which attempted to focus services and benefits upon these same children in the early primary grades. Summer programs proved especially effective since greater flexibility in scheduling and organization was possible. It was also easier to obtain highly qualified staff members than during the regular school year.

6. SUPPLEMENTARY DATA

A. Program Effectiveness

It was found that the majority of the respondents reported the Title I projects made "Substantial" and "Some" progress in achieving their first and second objectives as shown on Table XIV. The most common basis for making this judgment was a combination of professional observation, standardized test scores, and teacher-made tests. It was also noted that a total of 8,247 pupils made "Substantial" progress and 15,939 pupils made "Some" progress. Approximately 88 percent of all Title I participants showed positive progress with only 12 percent of the participants showing "Little or no" progress, according to the evaluation reports submitted by 110 respondents.

TABLE XIV

EFFECTIVENESS OF TITLE I PROJECTS IN MEETING OBJECTIVES

	SUBSTANTIAL PROGRESS	SOME PROGRESS	LITTLE OR NO PROGRESS
	Pupils	Pupils	Pupils
First Objective	4,644	8,505	2,252
Second Objective	3,603	7,434	1,726
Totals	8,247	15,939	3,978

*Basis For Judgment:	No. of Projects
Observations by professional staff	89
Standardized test scores	65
Teacher made tests	61
Rating scales, questionnaires	44
Other	29

Half of the respondents reported using a one group evaluation design with a pre-test and post-test on the project group to compare observed gains or losses with expected gains. A breakdown of the various evaluation designs utilized can be seen on Table XV.

TABLE XV

TYPES OF EVALUATION DESIGNS USED

DESIGN USED:	No. of Projects
One group design using a pre-test and post-test on the project group to compare observed gains or losses with expected gains.	54
One group design using test data on the project group, but no comparison data.	23
One group design using pre-test and/or post-test scores on the project group to compare observed performance with local, state, or national norms.	16
One group design using test data on the project group to compare observed performance with expected performance based upon data for past years in the project school.	15
Two group experimental designs using the project group and a conveniently available non-project group as the control.	4
Others or combinations	24

In evaluating the effectiveness of Title I programs, it was reported that there was "considerable" positive change in the educational experiences offered children in 51 projects as shown on Table XVI. It was also reported that "some" positive changes were noted in teachers' attitude, behavior with disadvantaged children, and method of approach in the majority of projects. The positive changes concerning members of the community were in the "little" and "some" positive change category. On the basis of the reported data, the most effective positive changes were concerned with children. Lesser positive changes were made on the community.

TABLE XVI

RATINGS OF TITLE I PROGRAMS EFFECTIVENESS

AREA	POSITIVE CHANGE			
	None	Little	Some	Considerable
CONCERNING CHILDREN:				
Educational opportunities	3	11	46	43
Educational experiences	2	3	49	51
Educational achievement	1	15	73	18
General attitude toward education	2	17	57	32
CONCERNING TEACHERS:				
Attitude	1	9	61	39
Behavior with disadvantaged children	0	11	66	32
Method of approach with disadvantaged children	0	10	65	36
Parent communication	4	28	48	24
CONCERNING MEMBERS OF THE COMMUNITY AND THEIR ATTITUDES TOWARD:				
Educational opportunities	5	35	47	19
Educational experiences	5	32	52	17
Educational achievement	5	33	57	12
Disadvantaged children	7	34	50	16

B. Dissemination of Information

The most common method used for disseminating Title I information, as shown on Table XVII, was the informal exchange of ideas. Slightly less than half of the respondents reported using formal presentations at meetings and letters as means of disseminating information. Other methods included parent-teacher conferences, school open house, teacher visitations, and newsletters.

TABLE XVII

TECHNIQUES UTILIZED FOR DISSEMINATING TITLE I INFORMATION

DISSEMINATION TECHNIQUE	No. of Projects Utilizing Technique
Informal exchange of ideas	81
Formal presentations at area meetings	49
Letters	47
News releases	20
Pictures	18
Brochures or pamphlets	13
Tapes	7
Others	39

7. STATISTICAL DATA

A. The data with regard to the number of Title I participants by grade level are presented in Table XVIII. The average number of participants in a Title I project was 144 with a range of from 9 to 953 participants.

TABLE XVIII

TITLE I PARTICIPANTS BY GRADE LEVEL (Including Summer)

Grade Level	Public School	Non Public School	Out of School	Total
Pre K	308	20		328
K	1063	13		1076
1	1333	23		1356
2	1219	32		1251
3	1106	23		1129
4	1076	50		1126
5	1054	28	1	1083
6	979	29		1008
7	1124	15	3	1142
8	1349	12	5	1366
9	1200	2	6	1208
10	1675	33	40	1748
11	1697	0	20	1717
12	1552	0	5	1557
Ungraded	176	27		203
TOTAL	16911	307	80	17298

Mean number of participants -------- 144
Range of number of participants ---- 9/953

Of the 17,289 Title I participants 2,461 students took part in twenty-four summer projects. The grade level placement of these students is shown on Table XIX.

TABLE XIX

SUMMER SCHOOL TITLE I PARTICIPANTS BY GRADE LEVEL

Grade Level	Public School	Non Public School	Out of School	Total
Pre K	60			60
K	101			101
1	233			235
2	235	1		236
3	266	12		278
4	228	21		249
5	222	9		231
6	223	5		228
7	104	4		108
8	161	9	2	172
9	86	2		88
10	227	16		243
11	122			122
12	60			60
Ungraded	8		42	50
TOTAL	2336	81	44	2461

Mean number of participants --------- 111
Range of number of participants ----- 12/819

There were 776 handicapped pupils participating in twelve special projects funded under P.L. 89-313. The numbers of pupils by grade level in these projects are shown on Table XX.

B. There were 277 full time staff members and 256 part time staff members employed during the 1967 fiscal year with Title I funds. A complete analysis of the number, positions, and estimated expenditures are presented in Table XXI, page 41 (all expenditure figures are estimates). It can be noted that the largest number of staff members employed were teacher aides or classroom assistants. There were 168 full time and 52 part time aides and assistants employed during the regular school year at an estimated expenditure of $682,897.

TABLE XX

SPECIAL PROJECT PARTICIPANTS IN TITLE I, P.L. 89-313 PROJECTS

REGULAR AND SUMMER		SUMMER ONLY
Grade Level	Public Schools	Public Schools
Pre K	21	0
K	54	2
1	91	2
2	84	2
3	77	1
4	85	1
5	16	3
6	16	2
7	18	2
8	14	0
9	29	3
10	24	5
11	16	0
12	20	3
Ungraded	211*	230*
TOTAL	776	256

*Includes 17 participants from schools for Neglected and Delinquent.

Mean number of participants ---------- 89
Range of number of participants -------- 7/552

TABLE XXI

PROGRAM STAFF MEMBERS EMPLOYED AND ESTIMATED TOTAL SALARIES PAID BY TITLE I, ESEA FOR FISCAL YEAR 1967

PROGRAM STAFF MEMBERS EMPLOYED AND TOTAL SALARY PAID FOR SERVICES PERFORMED (See OE Handbook IV for assignments)

	ACTIVITY ASSIGNMENT	NUMBER OF PROGRAM STAFF MEMBERS EMPLOYED				TOTAL SALARY PAID (Rounded to nearest dollar)
		AT ANY TIME		SUMMER PROGRAM		
		FULL TIME	PART TIME	FULL TIME	PART TIME	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	TOTAL NUMBER OF STAFF MEMBERS	277	256	72	55	$1,649,912
	STAFF MEMBERS BY ASSIGNMENT					
1	TEACHING - PRE-KINDERGARTEN	12		4		81,979
2	TEACHING - KINDERGARTEN	1	10		1	7,153
3	TEACHING - ELEMENTARY	20	27	30	8	169,802
4	TEACHING - SECONDARY	18	34	21	12	145,262
5	TEACHING - UNGRADED	11	21	2		33,100
6	TEACHER AIDE	168	52	2	4	682,897
7	LIBRARIAN		6			2,251
8	LIBRARY AIDE	3				11,960
9	SUPERVISION	1	5	4	3	21,805
10	DIRECTION AND MANAGEMENT	3	33	1	2	134,140
11	COUNSELING	14	14	3		165,606
12	PSYCHOLOGIST		2	1		1,250
13	TESTING		5		2	1,250
14	SOCIAL WORK		2			3,138
15	ATTENDANCE		3		1	14,017
16	NURSE	1	1			7,742
17	PHYSICIAN					-
18	DENTIST		1			3,397
19	CLERICAL	2	7	1	7	25,338
20	OTHER PROFESSIONAL	15	18	1	10	82,468
21	OTHER NON-PROFESSIONAL	8	15	2	5	$ 55,357

C. According to the data compiled from the individual evaluation reports, the major focus of Title I instructional activities was on "English-Reading" with approximately 7500 participants and on "English-Speech" with over 3000 participants as shown on Table XXII (all expenditure figures as estimates). Approximately 3600 pupils received "Guidance/Counseling" services during the year. About 4700 pupils were taken on field trips as reflected in the Service Activity "Transportation".

D. Actual expenditures of Title I funds for fiscal year 1967 are presented on Table XXIII, page 44 (information obtained from the Office of Business Services, Hawaii Department of Education). According to this data, the largest expenditures were in the instructional program with $1,319,014 for salaries, $12,385 for contracted services, and $206,798 for other expenses, such as instructional materials. The second largest expenditure was for fixed charges, which includes social security, health insurance, and retirement for all salaries paid.

Out of a total grant of $2,108,762 actual expenditures for the fiscal year amounted to $2,008,217 with balance of $100,545 in unexpended funds for fiscal year 1967, according to the annual fiscal report, Table XXIII, page 44.

As shown on Table XXIV, page 45, $77,631 was expended out of a grant of $113,393 for programs for children in schools for handicapped children. As in the regular Title I programs, the largest expenditure was for salaries.

There was an expenditure of $2,082 from a grant of $4,270 for instructional costs for a program for children in institutions for delinquent children under the amended Title I, according to the data on Table XXV, page 46. This amendment was passed and funds received late in the school year which precluded the full use of available funds for fiscal year 1967.

TABLE XXII

TITLE I PROGRAM INSTRUCTIONAL AND SERVICE ACTIVITIES

PROGRAM INSTRUCTIONAL AND SERVICE ACTIVITIES (At Any Time) Note. A child may be counted more than once.

ACTIVITIES	TOTAL NUMBER OF CHILDREN WHO PARTICIPATED IN INSTRUCTIONAL AND SERVICE ACTIVITIES						ESTIMATED COST OF ACTIVITY (Rounded to nearest dollar)
	ALL PARTICIPANTS BY GRADE SPAN (Public, Private, Out of School, and Institutionalized)				ENROLLED IN PRIVATE SCHOOLS	FROM INST'NS FOR NEL. & DEL.	
	PRE-K	KINDER-GARTEN	GRS. 1-6	GRS. 7-12			
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES							
1 ART	17	20	675	224			10,341
2 BUSINESS EDUCATION				104	1		4,118
3 CULTURAL ENRICHMENT		34	1,605	1,244			94,088
4 ENGLISH - READING		30	4,847	2,512	114		675,253
5 ENGLISH - SPEECH	17	34	2,143	847	49		204,921
6 ENGLISH - 2ND LANGUAGE			308	463			52,527
7 FOREIGN LANGUAGE				25			3,296
8 HOME ECONOMICS				331			3,819
9 INDUSTRIAL ARTS				426			16,298
10 MATHEMATICS			404	436	3		37,938
11 MUSIC	17		505	437			27,070
12 PHYS. ED. RECREATION			260	114			6,574
13 NATURAL SCIENCE			538	113	3		26,006
14 SOCIAL SCIENCE			309	535			19,395
15 VOCATIONAL EDUCATION				75			1,213
16 SPECIAL ACTIVITIES FOR HANDICAPPED	20	27	351	260			34,256
17 PRE-K & K (EXCEPT FOR HANDICAPPED)	487	252	5				167,261
18 OTHER	214	227	2,024	2,032	35		219,519
19 TOTAL ESTIMATED EXPENDITURES FOR INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES (Sum of 1 - 18) →							1,513,893
SERVICE ACTIVITIES							
1 ATTENDANCE	17	25	162	681			29,864
2 CLOTHING		20	223	25			560
3 FOOD	209	30	292	346	22		23,975
4 GUIDANCE COUNSELING		99	999	2,499	26		171,334
5 HEALTH - DENTAL				108			7,762
6 HEALTH - MEDICAL	37			236			5,678
7 LIBRARY	9	71	684	200			12,445
8 PSYCHOLOGICAL	80	5	317	36			2,368
9 SOCIAL WORK			80	50			3,400
10 SPEECH THERAPY							-
11 TRANSPORTATION	189	182	3,532	766	22		29,477
12 SPECIAL ACTIVITIES FOR HANDICAPPED			100				4,820
13 OTHER	282	270	5,423	2,668	64		120,786
14 TOTAL ESTIMATED EXPENDITURES FOR SERVICE ACTIVITIES (Sum of 1 - 13) →							412,469

NUMBER OF TITLE I STAFF MEMBERS WHO RECEIVED INSERVICE EDUCATION	1. NUMBER	2. ESTIMATED COST →	23,476
NUMBER OF PARENTS WHO RECEIVED COUNSELING AND OTHER SERVICES	1. NUMBER	2. ESTIMATED COST →	4,168
TOTAL ESTIMATED EXPENDITURES (Sum of A19, B14, C, and D) →			1,954,006

AMOUNT OF TITLE I FUNDS ALLOCATED, APPROVED, AND EXPENDED, FY ENDING JUNE 30, 1967 (At Any Time)

TOTAL ALLOCATION	B TITLE I FUNDS APPROVED (Rounded to nearest dollar)			
	1. FOR REPORTING AGENCY	2. FROM OTHER COOP. AGENCIES	3. TO OTHER COOP. AGENCIES	4. TOTAL NET AMOUNT APPROVED FOR THIS PROGRAM
$2,108,762	$	$	$	$ 2,108,762

C ESTIMATED EXPENDITURES FOR: →	1. EQUIPMENT	2. CONSTRUCTION	3. OTHER	4. TOTAL
	$128,363	$	$ 1,825,643	$ 1,954,006

OUTSTANDING FEATURES AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE FY 1967 TITLE I PROGRAM (Optional Item - Use reverse side)

TABLE XXIII

TITLE I PROJECT EXPENDITURES FOR FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1967
PROGRAM FOR CHILDREN IN LOW INCOME AREAS

SECTION B – ESEA TITLE I PROJECT EXPENDITURES BY SEA, LEA's, and STATE AGENCIES for Fiscal Year ending June 30, 1967	NAME OF STATE	DATE PREPARED
	Hawaii	Nov. 29, 1967

INSTRUCTIONS: 1. Prepare a separate "Project Expenditure Report" (Original and three copies) for each of the five programs shown below. Check only one box to identify the program being reported:

1 [x] PROGRAM FOR CHILDREN IN LOW-INCOME AREAS (737.1)
2 [ ] PROGRAM FOR CHILDREN OF MIGRATORY WORKERS (737.3)
3 [ ] PROGRAM FOR CHILDREN IN SCHOOLS FOR HANDICAPPED CHILDREN (737.4)
4 [ ] PROGRAM FOR CHILDREN IN INSTITUTIONS FOR NEGLECTED CHILDREN (737.5)
5 [ ] PROGRAM FOR CHILDREN IN INSTITUTIONS FOR DELINQUENT CHILDREN (737.5)

A. EXPENDITURES FOR OPERATION			AMOUNT OF TITLE I FUNDS EXPENDED AS OF AUGUST 31, 1967			
	EXPENDITURE ACCOUNTS	ACCOUNT NUMBER	SALARIES	CONTRACTED SERVICES	OTHER EXPENSES	TOTAL
	(1)		(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
1	Administration	100	76,936	4,545	7,459	88,940
2	Instruction	200	1,319,014	12,385	206,798	1,538,197
3	Attendance Services	300	51,173			51,173
4	Health Services	400		5,019	22	5,041
5	Pupil Transportation Services	500		37,968		37,968
6	Operation of Plant	600	1,224		2,742	3,966
7	Maintenance of Plant	700			2,535	2,535
8	Fixed Charges	800			134,521	134,521
9	Food Services	900	124		19,531	19,655
10	Student Body Activities	1000				
11	Community Services	1100				
12	Remodeling (Less than $2000)	1220C				
13	Equipment	1230			126,221	126,221
14	(Sum of Items 1-13) = SUB-TOTAL:		1,448,471	59,917	499,829	2,008,217

B. EXPENDITURES FOR CONSTRUCTION				
	EXPENDITURE ACCOUNTS	ACCOUNT NUMBER		TOTAL
15	Professional Services for Sites	1210A		
16	Sites and Site Additions	1210B		
17	Improvements to Sites	1210C		
18	Professional Services for Buildings	1220A		
19	New Buildings and Building Additions	1220B		
20	Remodeling ($2000 or more)	1220C		
21	Equipment (Not included under 13 above)	1230		
22			(Sum of Items 15 through 21) = SUB-TOTAL:	None
23	TOTAL EXPENDITURES FOR PERIOD ENDING AUGUST 31, 1967		(Items 14 + 22) = GRAND TOTAL:	2,008,217

TABLE XXIV

TITLE I PROJECT EXPENDITURES FOR FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1967
PROGRAM FOR CHILDREN IN SCHOOLS FOR HANDICAPPED CHILDREN

SECTION B – ESEA TITLE I PROJECT EXPENDITURES BY SEA, LEA's, and STATE AGENCIES for Fiscal Year ending June 30, 1967	NAME OF STATE	DATE PREPARED
	Hawaii	Nov. 29, 1967

INSTRUCTIONS: 1. Prepare a separate "Project Expenditure Report" (Original and three copies) for each of the five programs shown below. Check only one box to identify the program being reported:

1 ☐ *PROGRAM FOR CHILDREN IN LOW-INCOME AREAS (737.1)*
2 ☐ *PROGRAM FOR CHILDREN OF MIGRATORY WORKERS (737.3)*
3 ☒ *PROGRAM FOR CHILDREN IN SCHOOLS FOR HANDICAPPED CHILDREN (737.4)*
4 ☐ *PROGRAM FOR CHILDREN IN INSTITUTIONS FOR NEGLECTED CHILDREN (737.5)*
5 ☐ *PROGRAM FOR CHILDREN IN INSTITUTIONS FOR DELINQUENT CHILDREN (737.5)*

A. EXPENDITURES FOR OPERATION			AMOUNT OF TITLE I FUNDS EXPENDED AS OF AUGUST 31, 1967			
	EXPENDITURE ACCOUNTS	ACCOUNT NUMBER	SALARIES	CONTRACTED SERVICES	OTHER EXPENSES	TOTAL
	(1)		(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
1	Administration	100	4,152			4,152
2	Instruction	200	29,243	14,368	4,477	48,088
3	Attendance Services	300	9,946			9,946
4	Health Services	400		659		659
5	Pupil Transportation Services	500		5,749		5,749
6	Operation of Plant	600	184		337	521
7	Maintenance of Plant	700			10	10
8	Fixed Charges	800			3,875	3,875
9	Food Services	900				
10	Student Body Activities	1000				
11	Community Services	1100				
12	Remodeling (Less than $2000)	1220C			1,320	1,320
13	Equipment	1230			3,311	3,311
14	(Sum of Items 1-13) = SUB-TOTAL:		43,525	20,776	13,330	77,631

B. EXPENDITURES FOR CONSTRUCTION				
	EXPENDITURE ACCOUNTS	ACCOUNT NUMBER		TOTAL
15	Professional Services for Sites	1210A		
16	Sites and Site Additions	1210B		
17	Improvements to Sites	1210C		
18	Professional Services for Buildings	1220A		
19	New Buildings and Building Additions	1220B		
20	Remodeling ($2000 or more)	1220C		
21	Equipment (Not included under 13 above)	1230		
22			(Sum of Items 15 through 21) = SUB-TOTAL:	None
23	TOTAL EXPENDITURES FOR PERIOD ENDING AUGUST 31, 1967		(Items 14 + 22) = GRAND TOTAL:	77,631

TITLE I PROJECT EXPENDITURES FOR FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1967
PROGRAM FOR CHILDREN IN INSTITUTIONS FOR DELINQUENT CHILDREN

SECTION B – ESEA TITLE I PROJECT EXPENDITURES BY SEA, LEA's, and STATE AGENCIES for Fiscal Year ending June 30, 1967 | NAME OF STATE: Hawaii | DATE PREPARED: Nov. 29, 1967

INSTRUCTIONS: 1. Prepare a separate "Project Expenditure Report" (Original and three copies) for each of the five programs shown below. Check only one box to identify the program being reported:

1 ☐ PROGRAM FOR CHILDREN IN LOW-INCOME AREAS (737.1)

2 ☐ PROGRAM FOR CHILDREN OF MIGRATORY WORKERS (737.3)

3 ☐ PROGRAM FOR CHILDREN IN SCHOOLS FOR HANDICAPPED CHILDREN (737.4)

4 ☐ PROGRAM FOR CHILDREN IN INSTITUTIONS FOR NEGLECTED CHILDREN (737.5)

5 ☒ PROGRAM FOR CHILDREN IN INSTITUTIONS FOR DELINQUENT CHILDREN (737.5)

A. EXPENDITURES FOR OPERATION

	EXPENDITURE ACCOUNTS	ACCOUNT NUMBER	AMOUNT OF TITLE I FUNDS EXPENDED AS OF AUGUST 31, 1967 SALARIES	CONTRACTED SERVICES	OTHER EXPENSES	TOTAL
	(1)		(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
1	Administration	100				
2	Instruction	200			2,082	2,082
3	Attendance Services	300				
4	Health Services	400				
5	Pupil Transportation Services	500				
6	Operation of Plant	600				
7	Maintenance of Plant	700				
8	Fixed Charges	800				
9	Food Services	900				
10	Student Body Activities	1000				
11	Community Services	1100				
12	Remodeling (Less than $2000)	1220C				
13	Equipment	1230				
14	(Sum of Items 1-13) = SUB-TOTAL:				2,082	2,082

B. EXPENDITURES FOR CONSTRUCTION

	EXPENDITURE ACCOUNTS	ACCOUNT NUMBER	TOTAL
15	Professional Services for Sites	1210A	
16	Sites and Site Additions	1210B	
17	Improvements to Sites	1210C	
18	Professional Services for Buildings	1220A	
19	New Buildings and Building Additions	1220B	
20	Remodeling ($2000 or more)	1220C	
21	Equipment (Not included under 13 above)	1230	
22	(Sum of Items 15 through 21) = SUB-TOTAL:		
23	TOTAL EXPENDITURES FOR PERIOD ENDING AUGUST 31, 1967 (Items 14 + 22) = GRAND TOTAL:		2,082